The Church in the Balkans

The Trials, Schisms, Persecutions of the Church in the Various Balkan Countries from the First Century to Date

By
Joseph H. Ledit, S. J.

A Missionary Academia Study published by *The Society for The Propagation of the Faith and The Missionary Union of the Clergy*

ALMA COLLEGE
LIBRARY
Alma, California

★

COUNCIL OF NICAEA
ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM
CANON 28
JUSTINIANA PRIMA
ARCHBISHOP STEPINAC
EASTERN RITES
OECUMENICAL PATRIARCH
RESPONSA AD BULGAROS
MONOTHELITISM
SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS

★

Volume 7, Number 2
October, 1949

70 East 45th Street THE AMERICA PRESS New York 17, N. Y.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 3

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND 4

2. PRESENT STATUS 27

CONCLUSIONS 49

ABBREVIATIONS 50

NOTES 51

STUDY OUTLINE 59

NOTE ON THE AUTHOR 62

Imprimi Potest:
Leo Pouliot, S.J.
Provincial, Province of Lower Canada

Nihil Obstat:
Rt. Rev. Msgr. John M. A. Fearns
Censor Librorum

Imprimatur:
✠ Francis Cardinal Spellman, D. D.
Archbishop of New York

June 1, 1949

Introduction

1. The word *Balkan,* to designate Southeastern Europe, is new. It was borrowed at the beginning of the 19th century from the Turkish word which means "mountain," for the peninsula is mountainous, though perhaps not as much as Spain or Italy. Of old, most of the peninsula went under the name of Illyricum. In consequence of the migrations that began shortly after the Christian era and ended with the Turkish invasion, the Balkans became a medley of races and nationalities. Later, the Turks added a peculiar type of unity to that which the country already had.

2. After the Turks began to weaken, other large nations fought over the Balkans. Ethnographic and religious diversity were created within this territory which, nevertheless, has a unity of its own. It is extremely difficult to say precisely in what that unity consists, owing to a long existing state of acute unbalance. Hence the Balkans have been up to the present one of the most unstable spots of the entire world.

3. Geographically, the Balkans, though a peninsula, are far less cut off from the rest of the world than, say, Spain or Italy. They are divided from Asia Minor by the narrow straits of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. Now, a waterway may be a convenient dividing line for a treaty maker or a geographer; in practice, however, it constitutes a link, a means of intercourse. This is why large cities generally rise on both sides of important rivers, and why Constantinople belongs as much to Asia as ancient Chalcedon to Europe. For that reason, the Balkans will be intimately bound with Asia Minor during many centuries. The line that separates the Balkans from Central Europe is impossible to determine. It cannot be the Danube, for Rumania, though almost entirely north of it, certainly belongs to the Balkans, while Hungary, which is mostly south of the same river, belongs as certainly to Central Europe. Both countries claim Transylvania, which must be considered Balkanic.

Then there is the Voyvodina, where there are, mingled with the Slavs, strong Magyar and German minorities. Shaped like a funnel, the meeting place of Europe and Asia and the soul's desire of the peoples of Northwestern and Central Europe, the Balkans were due for a hectic history.

4. Our main purpose was to disentangle, to the best of our ability, the knot of nationalities and religions which is peculiar to the Balkans, and make of that peninsula the religious and political powder-keg of Europe. An immense amount of anti-Catholic propaganda is based on a false appreciation of the Balkan background; hence, before any missionary work can be properly contemplated, this trash must be removed. Of immediate interest is the chapter on the Apostolate of SS. Cyril and Methodius, whose activity is distorted in the current Bolshevik and pink literature in favor of schism. We consider it of great importance to properly situate the difference between religion and religious nationalism, in order to approach our separated brethren without hurting them unnecessarily and in order to make nations praise the Lord, and not put the Lord at the service of politics, as it is written: *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes.*

5. We did not give much time to the Middle Ages. Father Marion A. Habig ably covered the field in his Academia Study (Vol. 6, Number 2, October, 1948): *Catholic Missions in the Later Middle Ages.*

6. We suggest the following method of approach: Let each student take one given country, investigate its background in the historical part of our study (looking up, possibly, some of our available references, in order to get into the habit of working accurately). Once a clear picture of the background is had, follow whatever may be said in the current press about persecution in that given country or about the religious situation in that same country at the present time.

7. It might be a service to render to the Church simply to dispel whatever false notions may be spread about her activity in the countries today under fire. Bolshevik strategy is world-wide. The battle for Christendom in the Balkans may be won right now in the United States by the two great weapons of the Church, light and love . . . study and prayer!

8. Our study is divided into two parts. First, we shall endeavor to sketch the historical background of the religious situation in the Balkans in general; secondly, we shall take each nation separately.

1.

Historical Background

Illyricum

9. At the Council of Nicaea (325), it was decreed that "the ancient custom be observed throughout Egypt, Lybia and the Pentapolis, so that the Bishop of Alexandria have authority over all of them, for a similar custom holds for the Bishop of Rome. In like manner, let the privileges be kept in the case of Antioch and the other provinces" (Can. 6). There is no point in summing up the discussions raised around this canon.[1] Some have thought that the "other provinces" referred to were the 104 provinces of the empire, and that the privileges were the rights of the metropolitan bishops.[2] This does not seem correct, for the rights and privileges of metropolitan bishops were attended to in Can. 4 and 5. The Council of Constantinople (381) will refer to the three "dioceses" of Pontus (capital, Caesarea) Asia (Ephesus) and Thrace (Heraklea).[3] Many think that these three were the "other provinces" referred to by Nicaea. Thus, Alexandria held a particular sway over Egypt; Antioch exercised some sort of primacy over the diocese of "Orient"; Caesarea, Heraklea, and Ephesus had some privileges over their respective dioceses; Rome, an undefined authority over the rest. This, of course, prescinds from the supreme right of the Sovereign Pontiff as head of the Church.[4] Long before the time of Justinian, we see the Bishop of Rome exercising special authority over the entire Balkan peninsula with the exception of Thrace. Thrace consisted of the following provinces: Europe, Rhodope, Haemimons, Thrace, Scythia, and Lower Moesia—a deep band of territory south of the Danube along the Black Sea, the Sea of Marmara, and the northern Aegean to the Nestos. Constantinople, at first a suffragant of Heraclea, soon superseded it, ruled over Thrace, and eventually aimed at supremacy over all the Illyricum.

10. At first, all the Balkans with the exception of Thrace looked to Rome for guidance. Thus, at the time of the Council of Sardica (343),

i.e., Sofia in present-day Bulgaria, all the Balkan bishops with the exception of those of Thrace were considered Western.[5] Sirmium, present-day Mitrovica, near Belgrade, was famous during the entire Arian controversy and, of course, a Western city.[6]

11. In 379, when Theodosius acceded to the Eastern Empire, Illyricum was divided in the following manner:

> *Eastern Illyricum:* 2 dioceses: Dacia and Macedonia.
> Dacia had five provinces: Dacia I, Dacia II, Moesia II (upper) Dardania and Praevalitana.
> Macedonia had 6: Achaia, Macedonia, Crete, Thessaly, Epirus Vetus, Epirus novus.
> *Western Illyricum* was attached to the Praefecture of Italy and had five provinces: Pannonia I (upper), Pannonia II (lower), Savia, Dalmatia, Noricum Mediterraneum, Noricum Ripense.[7]

12. On a modern map follow the Danube from west to east. When you reach the great bend, follow the Danube from north to south; continue south after the Danube turns east bending the line westward until it reaches the Adriatic at the frontier of Albania. This line would be a fairly accurate division between East and West Illyricum. From 424 to 437, Western Illyricum also belonged to the Eastern Empire.

13. When Eastern Illyricum was attached to the Eastern Empire it remained under the jurisdiction of the Popes, not only as Sovereign Pontiffs but as Patriarchs of the West. There are two letters of Pope Siricius (384-99) to Anisius, Bishop of Thessalonica, one giving him the right to consecrate the bishops of Illyricum; the other giving him the right to judge.[8] After Siricius, the Popes continue to govern Illyricum through their vicar, the Bishop of Thessalonica.[9] On July 14, 421, a law of Theodosius II put the provinces of Illyricum under the jurisdiction of Constantinople;[10] the Pope protested and continued to govern the territory,[11] though Theodosius' law was entered into the Code of 439 and remained in the statutes. The schism of Acacius created difficulties owing to the fact that the Bishop of Thessalonica took the side of the Patriarch. The Pope excommunicated him and kept governing the Illyricum.[12] It does not appear that the Vicariate of Thessalonica was reestablished after the schism of Acadius was ended (519),[13] except for the provinces of Macedonia I, Thessaly, Achaia, Crete, Old and New Epirus.[14] Justinian established the primate of *Justiniana Prima* over Dacia I, Dacia II, Moesia II, Dardania and Prevalitana,[15] but the jurisdiction of the Popes over that territory is far more evident than that of the Primate.[16] Until 733, the Popes governed in peace, and practically without contradiction, the entire Illyricum.

14. At the time of the Council of Nicaea (325), Constantinople was a suffragant of the Metropolitan See of Heraklea, on the Sea of Marmara. St. Alexander, then bishop of the imperial city (314-337), was not present at the Council. Shortly after his death, the Arians took over the city.[17] A small Council of 150 bishops (381), later known as the Second Oecumenical, (the Papal Legates at the Council of Chalcedon, Fourth Oecumenical, seemed to ignore it),[18] was presided over for a while by St. Gregory of Nazianzus (381). It decided that "the Bishop of Constantinople must have the preeminence of honor after the Bishop of Rome, for this city is new Rome."[19] From then on, the bishops of the city—saintly ones like St. John Chrysostom, and less saintly ones—intervened not only in Thrace, but in Asia and Pontus as well.[20] The See of Antioch was soon in the shadow, and a fearful battle was waged for primacy between Alexandria and Constantinople. By the time of the Council of Chalcedon (451), Alexandria had been routed;[21] Canon 28 took note of the victory and introduced a nasty principle in Church Government: "The Fathers gave properly privileges to Rome, because that city was imperial. Moved by the same consideration, the 150 bishops gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of New Rome, judging rightly that a city, honored with a senate and the seat of empire, and having equal privileges with the ancient queen city of Rome, should be extolled and magnified in ecclesiastical matters as well." No one denies that bishops of important cities may obtain special prerogatives, for the sake of more convenient administration. The authority of the Pope, however, does not spring from human factors. It is *juris divini.* Constantinople mistook political prominence for apostolic primacy. Canon 28 was adopted in the absence of Papal Legates. It was confirmed in the following session over their protest.[22] Pope St. Leo I waged a long, difficult battle until he obtained from Emperor Marcian a disapproval of said canon.[23] But it remained on the books. It is the charter of cesaropapism, for if ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction follow upon civil prominence, then politics perforce rule the Church. There is no reason why Moscow should not today rule over all ancient Orthodoxy; and Constantinople, reduced to a parish in a Turkish city, should not even have a bishop—let alone an oecumenical patriarch! Though Marcian acknowledged St. Leo's logic, the combined desire of the emperor to use the Church as a means of Government, and of the Patriarch to outshine Rome became eventually irresistible.[24]

15. In a short time, the emperors had their bishops subdued. When Basiliscus (476-78) imposed Monophysism, some 500 bishops signed his encyclical. This we have from Evagrius,[25] though round numbers generally sound suspicious.[26] As soon as trouble started and Basiliscus withdrew,[27] they signed *libelli* of retractation.[28] Then, Zeno (474-491) imposed his *Henoticum*[29] and his bishops preached the *Henoticum.* For thirty-five years Rome and Constantinople were divided by schism (484-519).[30]

16. This was scarcely patched up when cesaropapism really came into its own with Justinian (527-565). Jurists, artists, archaeologists admire this Dalmatian, the codifier of Roman law, the builder of Hagia Sophia, the emperor who gave magnificence to an already brilliant empire. Theologians are far more wary. Thus Father Vailhé:

> Dogmatizing freely against Origen and his partisans, against Theodor of Mopsuestia and Ibas, using disloyal weapons against monophysism and ending his days in the skin of a monophysist, Justinian indeed is the father of this religious despotism, baptized with the barbarian though significant name of cesaropapism. He willed it as a fatal inheritance of his successors.[31]

17. Monothelitism began to incubate about 610, and caused an immense amount of trouble (the story of Pope Honorius) before it brought about an open break (638-681).[32] The empire was aflame with those disputes, whilst Islam crept up, swallowing Egypt, Palestine, Syria, entering into Asia Minor, generally at the call of one of the two warring Christian factions. Monothelitism was scarcely over when the maddest of heresies, perfectly inconceivable in the Orient, iconoclasm, broke out with authentic fury.

18. It took a little time before the bishops became docile. At the Council of the palace of Hieria (753),[33] 388 bishops approved iconoclasm. Resistance was indeed difficult. The treatment inflicted by Copronymus to two patriarchs who owed their dignity to his favor, yet displeased him, Anastasius (729-752)[34] and Constantine II (753-65),[35] is beyond description. Iconoclasm was condemned in the Second Council of Nicaea (787).[36] But it began all over again under the reign of Leo the Armenian (813-820)[37] and continued until 843.[38] Between the two crises, there had been a third one over the adulterous marriage of Constantine VI (780-97).[39] Thus, "from 610 to 843, over a period of 233 years, the Byzantine Church had spent 149 (exactly two thirds) out of the Roman communion . . . from 638 to 681, on account of monothelitism; from 795 to 811 owing to moechianism or the adulterous marriage of Constantine VI; from 726 to 787 and from 814 to 843

due to iconoclasm."[40] It is difficult to consider either Photius or Cerularius as the initiators of the Eastern schism. Prior to Photius, Constantinople was always and obviously in the wrong. What Photius did was to give the Patriarchs of Constantinople a few badly needed arguments for their fight against the West.

19. The reader can easily find information on the Photius crisis: his usurpation (859), the anxieties of Pope Nicolas I, and the Photian synod of Constantinople (861), the condemnation of Photius by the Roman synod (863), the rebellion of the Patriarch, his encyclical to the Eastern Patriarchs and the polemics over the *Filioque* (867), his condemnation of Pope Nicholas (867), his own deposition and the return of St. Ignatius to the See of Constantinople (November, 867), the Council of Constantinople and the condemnation of Photius (Eighth Oecumenical, 869-70). Then Ignatius ruled peacefully with the emperor's favor, though getting into trouble with Pope John VIII (872-882) over Bulgaria. After Ignatius' death, Photius was begged to return by the emperor, and was accepted by Pope John VIII. What happened later is confused, though modern scholars increasingly agree that Photius died in some sort of unity with the Holy See, yet holding to his doctrine on the Holy Spirit in his Mystagogia.[41] It was obvious, by then, that Byzantine politics were the determining factor of Church unity or disunity.

20. Photius was destined to be the great standard bearer of anti-Romanism. Canonized towards the end of the 10th century, his name was to be commemorated each year on the Sunday of Orthodoxy (together, curiously enough, with that of his adversary, St. Ignatius), as champion of the true faith. He will be hailed until the end of Eastern orthodoxy as the champion of purity, humility and orthodoxy, against Western pride, error and sin. His arguments on the "addition to the symbol," though disproved a thousand times, are still used today. Catholic historians deal severely with him, for they hold him responsible for the Eastern schism. Without Photius, things might perhaps have been patched up later.

21. After Photius, the relations between Constantinople and Rome never became intimate. This period, for that matter, is perhaps the most depressing in the history of the Papacy. From the death of John VIII (882) to the condemnation of Cerullarius (1054), 42 Popes occupied the See of Peter; an average of four years each. Several were murdered. There is no necessity, nor usefulness in raking up forever

the lives of men like Pope Sergius III, John XI, and the wretched man who scandalized even his contemporaries, John XII (955-64). In those years when the East needed Rome so much, Rome gave scandal! There were few contacts.[42] At the beginning of the century, when Peter of Antioch was young, unity was still existing.[43] But it was broken between 912 and 923 over the fourth marriage of Leo VI the Wise (886-912). It seems that around the year 1024 the final break had already taken place.[44] Thus we reach the age of Michael Cerularius, when the schism became permanent. Curiously enough, it scarcely attracted the attention of contemporary chroniclers.[45] Cerularius, however, brought the anti-Roman polemic to a popular level.[46] He blamed Romans for visible, ritual matters that everyone could observe, and placed the wickedest interpretation possible on everything. Discussions on the wearing or not wearing of a beard, for instance, obtained a tremendous importance. After Cerularius, hatred of Rome slowly passed into the people.

The Slavs

22. The invasion of the barbarians, in the 5th century, caused immense havoc: Goths, Huns, Avars often passed through the Balkans. Sirmium was utterly destroyed (580) and the last bishop of the famous See took refuge in Constantinople, whence he was brought to Italy by Pope St. Gregory I. Justinian's endeavors to develop his native country, to which he gave the Roman name of *Justiniana prima,* were doomed to failure.

23. Of those invaders, the Slavs were destined to make the greatest impression. No one knows when they first came. Some have them drifting in during the 2nd century. In 531, according to Procopius, Justinian took measures to protect the Danube "for often, the Huns, the Antes and the Slavs, had crossed the river and inflicted very great and very shameful damage on the Romans."[47] For three years the Slavs remained quiet, but in 534 the Romans were beaten, and from then on the Slavs crossed the river at will. About the year 549 the same Procopius places a horrible story. Three thousand Slavs had crossed the Danube and no one had been able to hinder them. Then they divided their forces and invaded Thrace and Illyricum. They took prisoner the general Asbade, cut strips off the skin of his back and burned him alive. They roamed farther and in the one city of Toperon (later better known as Rusium), they murdered some 15,000 people

and drove the women and children into captivity. "Throughout Illyricum and Thrace, the earth was strewn far and wide with unburied bodies. The people they met they killed not with the sword, nor the lance, nor any of the customary ways of killing. . . ."[48] They impaled them. The gory details are to be found in Procopius, whose testimony is far more impressive than that of later historians who sang Justinian's triumphs, for Procopius died in 562.

24. Yet, after about a century, those very Slavs whose name had infused so much terror in the Illyricum and the entire Roman empire gave an unheard of example of Christian meekness. They had gradually seeped in everywhere; many were brought to Asia, and from then on Arab historians will often mention their presence and their deeds. Wherever they met Christendom, they gradually accepted Christianity—in the form in which it was presented to them. The first Slav *nation* to receive Christianity was, we believe, that of the Croats, who asked for baptism "in the days of Emperor Heraclius." This Heraclius, according to Farlati's calculations, must have been Constantine Pogonatos (648-685).[49] The matter was referred to Rome. The Pope, who must have been Vitalianus (657-672), acceded to their desire. Then the Croats did something absolutely remarkable:

> For the Croats, after receiving baptism, made a pact, and swore to Saint Peter, giving him their word written in their own hands, that they would never invade a foreign country, but would keep peace with each and all that would be willing; and, in turn, they received from the Roman Pontiff an imprecation that if other people were ever to attack the land of the Croats and infest it with war, then God would fight for them and avenge them, and Peter, the disciple of Christ, would obtain victory for them.[50]

25. The name of the Croat prince who signed that astounding pact —possibly one of the very first non-aggression pacts in all history—was Porga. John of Ravenna, who was the first bishop of Spalato (consecrated 650, died 680), is venerated by the Croats as their first apostle. At that time, probably by means of the same clergy who had baptized the Croats, the Serbs, too, were received into the Church.[51] They, with the Croats, constituted one Christian family. There was a very wonderful glow about the dawn of Slavdom in the Balkans.

26. It is difficult to say how long they remained faithful to their baptism. They had relapsed into paganism when Charlemagne attacked them. His troops did not treat the Croats kindly. Quoting the Porphyrogenetos once more:

For the Franks used them so cruelly that they would throw to the dogs their suckling babes. As the situation became unbearable, the Croats rebelled, killed the princes received from the Franks; then, a large army came from France; after seven years of war, the Croats obtained, though with difficulty, the upperhand and they got rid of their prince Cotzilim. Then, having obtained freedom and independence, they asked the Roman Pontiff for baptism. The bishops sent to them baptized them. Their prince was then Porin.[52]

27. The bishop who brought to the Croats their second baptism, in 832, must have been Peter, Archbishop of Spalato.[53] From then on, the devotion of the Croats to the Holy See never faltered; there was obscure unpleasantness during the last years of Patriarch St. Ignatius, who fought hard for the Illyricum;[54] Pope John VIII, writing to Prince Branimir, on June 7, 879, congratulated him on his return to the Roman Church.[55] But, St. Ignatius was no schismatic. Dante, seeking an example of utter devotion, could imagine nothing better than the wonderment of a Croat in the basilica of St. Peter, in Rome, looking at Veronica's veil.[56]

28. The Serbs, however, turned to Constantinople—or was it the other way around? Pope John VIII complained to King Michael (or Boris) of Bulgaria that St. Ignatius had sent—was it to Bulgaria?—a false bishop by the name of George. This George, in turn, had promoted to the See of Belgrade[57] a Slav by the name of Sergius, who had been quite malicious, had obtained priesthood illicitly, had been deposed by his own bishop, and was moreover a eunuch.[58] After this incident, the story of the Serbs relapses into a long night.

29. Other Slavs, in the meantime, were touched by the Gospel. The Slovenes were converted by the Patriarchs of Aquilea. Those farther north, who lived in present-day Kärnten right up to the Danube, were the solicitude of Frankish missionaries ever since the days of King Dagobertus (died 639), though their conversion must be attributed to a later date.[59] All along the border of the growing German empire the Slavs were knocking at the door of the Church and of history, whilst the Russians, after an almost successful attack against Constantinople, asked Patriarch Photius for a bishop.[60] Yet, little progress will be made among them all until the apostolate of SS. Cyril and Methodius.

SS. Cyril and Methodius[61]

30. At the beginning of the 9th century a Slav prince by the name of Pribina, or Priwina, had organized for himself a kingdom where today is Western Slovakia. About 832 Archbishop Adalramnus of

Salzburg consecrated a church in his capital, the beautiful little city of Nitra.[62] Then came Moimir from the West and drove out Pribina. The Slovaks hold a grudge against the Czechs ever since! This was all vehemently explained in 1932, when the 1100th anniversary of the consecration of that church was celebrated. Exiled from his country, Pribina went to the Germans, became a Christian, and established himself on the shores of Lake Balaton where he built a considerable number of churches.[63] In time, Moimir was driven away from Moravia by his nephew, Raztiz or Rostislav, who had obtained German aid for that purpose.[64] Raztiz did not like his allies. He knew of Byzantium, (the recent excavations at Uherské Hradisce have established that the contact between Byzantium and Moravia existed already.)[65] Raztiz decided to send an embassy to Constantinople. It arrived at the end of 862.

31. Two famous men were in Constantinople at the time: Constantine the philosopher, and his brother Methodius. They were from Thessalonica, probably of Slavic descent, and had returned shortly before from a mission to the Khazars—the people who had settled between the Volga and the Caucasus and had adopted the Jewish religion. They were asked to leave for Moravia. Constantine, with God's aid (his biographer speaks of a revelation) invented a Slav alphabet, and translated the book of Gospels—the liturgical Evangeliarium of the Eastern rite, the first Gospel being that of Easter Sunday: In the beginning was the Word. . . . When they reached Moravia, they turned into Slav "the morning office, the hours, vespers, the small vespers, the ritual for the Sacraments." The Slav population of Moravia was thrilled at having this liturgy in their own language. This was indeed different from what the German missionaries had brought. The two brothers were there scarcely more than a year when the German army conquered Moravia.[66] So much trouble came with the Latin priests (some of them were more soldiers than chaplains), that they decided to leave. They stopped for a while in Pannonia, on the shores of Lake Balaton (in present day Hungary), where Pribina's son, Kotsel, gave them a magnificent welcome. They decided they needed more priests to carry on the work. Off they went to Venice where they received an invitation from Pope Nicolas I to come to Rome.

32. They went, bringing with them the relics of St. Clement I, the Pope who had been sent to Crimea, which Constantine had found when on his way to the Khazars. The reception granted to the two brothers

and to the relics they brought was indeed indescribable. An idea of it may still be had from the frescoes painted in the basement of the Church of St. Clement in Rome. After the festivities, the question of the liturgical language was taken up. Constantine developed his familiar argument that God had created every language. Moreover, many people praised God in their own language: "Armenian, Persian, Abasgian, Iberian, Sugds[67] (Sogdians?), Avars, Turks, Egyptian, Syrian and many others."[68] Of liturgical books existing in Avar, Turkish, or Sogdian, nothing is known outside of this testimony. The Abasgians and Iberians, both peoples of Georgia, depended more or less loosely on Antioch until their autonomy in the 6th century; hence, it is difficult to imagine that their liturgical language was a Byzantine gift. Persians used Syriac from the very beginning of their ecclesiastical existence. So did the Syrians in Syria (though at the time of Cyril and Methodius they may have already partially adopted Arabic). The Byzantine tried their very best to eradicate Alexandrian tradition in Egypt, and Slavonic in Bulgaria after the conquest of the Bulgaroctonos. That the Slavs received, through the hands of Cyril and Methodius, their liturgical language must not be attributed blindly to the Byzantine patriarchate. Constantinople (later Moscow) never granted the use of a new liturgical language except under duress.

33. Constantine's books were then examined and found correct.[69] His disciples were ordained. The two brothers held religious ceremonies in various Roman churches, as pilgrims always do, but at St. Paul's they sang the whole night (vsenoščnoie). Constantine also translated a Latin Missal, the *Sacramentarium Gregorianum,* for use among the Slavs.[70] Then he fell sick, made the monastic profession under the name of Cyril, and died (February 3, 869). They gave him a Papal funeral.

34. Shortly after Cyril's death a legation came from Pannonia's Kotsel begging the Pope to send Methodius.[71] Sometime later, Methodius returned with a splendid embassy of twenty notables; at Kotsel's request, the Pope consecrated him to the See of St. Andronicus (Sirmium). Thus, Methodius' archdiocese was as boundless as the Slav immensity.

35. The Archbishop of Sirmium and Papal Legate reached Moravia by the end of 869 and found the country laid waste. Raztizh had been betrayed by his nephew, Svatopulk, as he himself had sold Moimir.

Methodius was arrested, brought to Bavaria, tried before a Synod of the Archbishop of Salzburg, and the Bishops of Passau and Freising. He received blows, threats with the whip, "beastly cruelty," as Pope John VIII will later say in stinging letters sent to the three bishops. Methodius spent three years in prison. Finally, he was able to send a messenger to the Pope, whose reaction was swift as lightning. He suspended the three bishops until Methodius was freed.[72] He forbade Methodius to use the Slav language in the singing of the Mass.[73] Methodius, however, did not heed the prohibition. He was denounced to Rome by some of the other party, and Pope John summoned him (879).[74]

36. Methodius obeyed, came quickly, justified himself, convinced the Pope who sent a letter to Svatopulk containing the following:

> For we are warned by sacred authority to praise the Lord not only in three, but in all languages, as it is written *Praise the Lord all ye nations: praise him, all ye people* (Ps. 116, 1), and the Apostles filled with the Holy Spirit *spoke with divers tongues the wonderful works of God* (Act. II, 4, 1); Hence Paul announces with his celestial trumpet: *That every tongue should confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father* (Phil. II, 11). Of these tongues he speaks to us clearly enough in the first epistle to the Corinthians, when advising us that *Speaking with tongues. we edify the church of God* (1 Cor. XIV, 5). Nor is it in any way against pure doctrine or faith to sing Masses in that same Slavonic tongue, nor to read the Holy Gospel, or the divine lessons of New and Old Testament, well translated and interpreted, or to sing all other offices or hours.[75]

37. This seems as categorical as can be. The letter was written "mense junio, indictione XIII," therefore in 880. Five years later, in 885 (the letter is not dated, but this date must be accepted), Pope Stephan V sent to the same Svatopulk another letter containing the exact opposite:

> As to the divine offices, and sacred mysteries (Sacraments) and solemn Masses which the same Methodius presumed to celebrate in the language of the Slavs, though he had taken an oath on the sacred body of the blessed Peter that he would no longer do so, we are horrified at his criminal perjury. That no one in the future presume to do so, we forbid it with the authority of God and our apostolic authority, except that for the edification of the simple and illiterate people, we grant and exhort that an exposition of the Apostle or the Gospel be given to them in that tongue by those who know it.[76]

38. The contradiction between the two letters is so glaring that the authenticity of the first, or the second, or of both has been challenged. The letter of 885 is confirmed by the *Commonitorium* given to the Papal mission composed of Dominic, John and Stephen that was sent to the Moravians.[77] Moreover, it is the cause of the unflinching attitude of the Holy See for the three hundred years following the year 885. The authenticity of the letter of 880 rests on documentary proof. It is

absolute. So far, Father Lapôtre proposed the only intelligent explanation.[78]

39. He traced the *Regestum* of Pope John VIII (Vol. I of the Papal *Regesta* in the Vatican archives) to about 1265-1276 when a Canon Berardus brought it over from Monte Cassino. He then established how that volume was but a copy of yet another volume, already hard to read when it was copied, which was the original Vatican register, brought down to Monte Cassino during the troubles that followed upon the murder of Pope John VIII (Dec. 8, 882). When in Monte Cassino, the *Regestum* could not be consulted by the Holy See. Therefore, the letter of 885 is independent of that of 880.

40. There is, however, a striking similarity between the two letters as to some of the sentences used. Lapôtre explains it like this: In 880, Methodius was given an auxiliary in the person of Wiching who had accompanied him to Rome. Now, this Wiching seems to have been a scoundrel. We shall see him receiving, in 885, the tribute of praise given to Methodius in 880, yet when Methodius reached his See in 880, he found every one turned against him, so that the Pope had to write *another* letter stating that he approved of him, Methodius, that he had given no other instructions in his letter to Svatopulk, that he had written no other letter, given no other instructions to Wiching nor exacted any oath from him.[79] Father Lapôtre concludes that Wiching falsified in 880 the letter to Svatopulk, and created the trouble dispelled by the Pope's second letter. When Methodius died in 885, Wiching returned to Rome with *his* forged letter of 880. The *Regestum* of John VIII was no longer in the Vatican. Pope Stephen V, in perfectly good faith, used the letter showed to him, and that was the end of the Slav liturgical language. Twice Pope John X prohibited the use of the Slav liturgy in his letter to the Bishop of Salona and his suffragants; to Tomislav "regi Chroatorum" and to Michael "dux Chulmorum";[80] John XIII (965-72) extended the same prohibition to Boleslas, Duke of Bohemia;[81] Nicolaus II to the Council of Dalmatia (1058).[82] The Croats nearly went into schism and had to be pacified by a new mission sent by Pope Alexander II (1061-73) which none the less damned the Slav liturgy as well.[83] St. Gregory VII, though very broadminded in other circumstances, forbade the same to Wratislaw of Bohemia (1079).[84] It was only in 1248 that Pope Innocent IV finally authorized a custom that the preceding 350 years had not stamped out:

Nos igitur attendentes quod sermo rei et non est res sermoni subjecta, licentiam tibi in illis dumtaxat partibus, ubi de consuetudine observatur praemissa (dummodo sententia ipsius varietate litterae non laedatur), auctoritate praesentium concedimus postulatam.[85]

41. It may be wondered if this concession did not come with the discovery of the long lost Regestum of John VIII, though Lapôtre has it transferred to the Vatican Library a little later (under Clement IV, 1265-1276). Be that as it may, Wiching's treachery was fatal to the apostolate among the Slavs.

42. When Wiching triumphed in 885, the disciples of St. Methodius scattered. Of Gorazd, nothing is known. Clement, Naum, Angelar and others went to Bulgaria where they were received with open arms by King Boris.

The Bulgarians

43. The Bulgarians probably began to enter the empire long before the great invasion of the 7th century. They had perhaps drifted in from the 2nd century onwards. In 659 or 660, Asparukh crossed the Danube and settled in Scythia. In a short time, his sturdy army conquered all the territory down to the mountains and exacted a tribute from Constantinople. At the beginning of the 9th century, Krum united the Bulgars, took Sardica (Sofia) in 809, beat the Emperor Nicephorus Phocas two years later and established the Bulgarian kingdom where it is today.

44. One of his successors, Boris (852-888), decided to become a Christian. He received baptism at the hand of the Greeks, took the name of Michael for his godfather, Michael the Drunkard (842-867), met with considerable opposition from the nobility, crushed it,[86] and wrote to Photius for a national hierarchy. The Byzantine Patriarch answered with a remarkable letter, containing an exposition of faith, a very interesting and shrewd instruction on Government, but sent no bishops.[87] Boris turned to Rome. Pope Nicolas I sent to him his *Responsa ad Bulgaros*,[88] famous in history of Canon Law, and the two bishops Formosus of Porto, and Paul of Populonia, who met with marvelous success. Boris wanted Formosus to become Bulgaria's archbishop, and it is perhaps a pity that this request and the one to keep deacon Marinus, were not granted. Boris turned once more to Constantinople.

45. Clement and his disciples, driven out of Moravia, were settled in the region of Ochrida.[89] Shortly after their arrival, Boris abdicated

(888) to enter a monastery. But when his son, Vladimir, returned to paganism, Boris left his cell, led an army against him, chastised him severely, enthroned his youngest son, Symeon (893-927) and went back to his monastery where he died thirteen years later.

46. Symeon's reign was the golden age of Bulgarian literature. Clement wrote sermons, translated Saints' lives, built monasteries, established bishoprics, finished the translation of the *Triodion* and was venerated as a saint almost immedately after his death. Symeon, himself a distinguished writer, was crowned by a Papal Legate in 924.[90] His son, Peter (927-69)[91] received the same honor, but did not have the martial spirit of his father. One of his boyars, Shishman, broke away from him and set up an independent kingdom in Western Bulgaria (between the Rhodope and the Adriatic). Constantinople did not wait long to attack Peter, who was defeated. The Russian Sviatoslav, a superb savage magnificently described by Leo the Deacon,[92] swooped from the north on the wretched country and took Peter's son, Boris, prisoner. Boris called to the Byzantine for help, was eventually liberated, and brought to Constantinople. He renounced his kingdom and was made a Byzantine patrician. Western Bulgaria put up a noble fight against the Greeks, almost rocked the empire in 986, but was eventually defeated by the savagery of the Bulgaroktonos (the Bulgar-Killer).

47. Tsar Samuel (977-1014), who had also received the royal crown from the Pope, died in misery in 1014 when seeing 15,000 prisoners sent back to him after having their eyes gouged out. The wars lasted a little longer. They finished in 1018. But Bulgaria was no more. The Bulgarian Patriarchate, given by the Pope to Symeon, and certainly to Peter, had followed the vicissitudes of the country, wandering from Pereiaslavetz to Dorostolon, to Sofia, to Vidin, to Ochrida.[93] Then it was suppressed by Basil. From 1020 to 1393, Greek archbishops governed the Western Bulgarians. The most famous of all was Theophylact, not unfriendly to Rome,[94] but two of them, Leo of Ochrida and Demetrios Chomatianos, are heavily responsible for the Eastern schism. In 1282 the Serbs took Uskub (Skoplje) from the Greeks, extended their territory in Macedonia, and established a patriarchate of their own at Pec (1346). This weakened Ochrida until the conquest of the Balkans by the Turks brought about a new reorganization.

48. When Eastern Bulgaria fell to the Greeks (969), the people kept on rebelling, but their efforts were unsuccessful until two Rumanians, John and Peter Assen, united them, and reestablished the ancient

kingdom. In 1188 the Greek bishop of Tirnovo was sent out of the country, and his place was taken by the Bulgar Basil who crowned John Tsar. As soon as their younger brother, Joannikios or Caloian, succeeded to the throne (1197) he endeavored to make contact with the Pope. Innocent III (1198-1216), hearing that the King was descended from a noble ancestry of the city of Rome, sent him a legate of the Greek rite by the name of Dominic of Brindisi.[95] The correspondence exchanged between Innocent III and the Bulgarians is delightful.[96] The Bulgarians got what they wanted: a royal crown for Caloian; a primate's privileges for Bishop Basil. Innocent III, who was severe in ritual matters, did not acknowledge Basil's consecration as valid;[97] hence the bishop had to be anointed by Cardinal Leo de sancta Cruce. In those days, it seems, the imposition of hands was insufficient; unction was also required. When Caloian met a hero's death before Thessalonica (1207), he was succeeded by his nephew Boril (1207-18) of whom little is known. John II Assen (1218-41), who was perhaps the most brilliant, courageous, but the most utterly unreliable of the dynasty, was certainly in communion with Rome until 1230. In 1232 Gregory IX already complained that the Bulgars had dropped from unity.[98] In 1236 he threatened John II with a crusade if he did not stop his ten-year old daughter Helen from marrying Theodore, the twelve-year old son of John Vatatzes of Nicaea; in 1238, he allowed King Bela of Hungary to undertake a crusade against the Bulgarian tsar: both times did the prince avert the blow.[99] After that date, there may have been sporadic contacts between Bulgaria and the Holy See; thus, Bulgaria's primate Joachim accepted the union of Lyons at a council of Constantinople (1277),[100] held by Catholic Patriarch John Beccos. By that time, the Serbians had already won the hegemony in the Balkans.

The Kingdom of the Nemanyas

49. Towards the middle of the 12th century a Serbian prince by the name of Stephan Nemanya, son of Deza, who had stolen the kingdom of Serbia from a certain Radoslav, gathered together the Serbian clans.[101] In 1159 he took the title of *great zhupan,* whom the Roman scribes delighted in calling *Meganippanus,* or *Megajupanus;* he also became quite interested in the ecclesiastical politics of Dalmatia.[102] He had three sons: Stephen, who succeeded him as great zhupan of Rascia

and Serbia (1196), Vukan, who became King of Dioclea and Dalmatia, and Rascus who ran away from home to become a monk on Mount Athos under the name of St. Savva.[103] Vukan asked Innocent III for a Papal legation, and an important council was held "ad locum ubi antiquitus concilium celebrari solitum fuit."[104] Stephen then, too, wrote to Pope Innocent and received a letter from him,[105] but his desire to receive a Legate was stopped by Hungary.[106] Pope Innocent III, however, sent the Archbishop of Colocza to him.[107] Later, Honorius III (1216-1227) sent a Legate with a royal crown for Stephen and his wife, a niece of the venetian Enrico Dandolo, an ardent Catholic.[108] Shortly after, Savva became Archbishop of Serbia. It is said that he obtained this delegation from the Patriarch of Constantinople. It is not clear whether Savva went to Nicaea or to Constantinople, held at the time by the Latins. In 1219, the Nicaean Emperor Theodore Lascaris had married the daughter of the Latin Emperor. According to Serbian tradition, Savva crowned Stephen on his return from Nicaea, though Dandolo says explicitly the ceremony was performed by a Roman Cardinal. To say the least, Savva's anti-Romanism is not clear. In fact, any anti-Roman activity on the part of Savva without swift protest on the part of Pope Honorius III seems unthinkable.

50. Stephen died in 1221. In 1288 Pope Nicholas IV (1288-92) wrote to the two brothers Stephen Urosh, and Stephen Dragutin. Dragutin became a Catholic, went to Bosnia and fought the Bogomils. Although Urosh had a crusade twice preached against him by Papal Legates, he twice evaded it. He was as much of an opportunist in politics as in religion. The greatest of the dynasty was Stephen Urosh Dushan, who acceded to the throne in 1331. He was a powerful conqueror, a subtle politician, a lawgiver. It is said he was to Serbia what Napoleon was in later times to France. In 1346 he brought together his clergy at Skoplje (Uskub), declared the Serbian Church autocephalous, had himself anointed and crowned "Emperor of the Serbs and the Greeks." Later, when in trouble with the Magyars, he wrote to Innocent VI (1352-62), but when the Papal Legate refused to kiss his feet, he forbade his Catholic subjects to attend his Mass. His German garrison proudly disobeyed. He died in 1355. He was the last great ruler Serbia had, though one must regret he sacrificed religious unity to immediate politics. At the battle of Kossovo (1388) Serbia lost its independence.

51. Our sketch of medieval Balkans would be incomplete without a mention of the Bogomils,[109] a curious sect of obscure origin, development, end, and survival. A priest, named Bogomil (Slav for Theophilus), known only through Slav texts, preached in the days of Tsar Peter (927-950) and had quite a following, even perhaps in the imperial family, mostly in and about Philippopolis (today Plovdiv). Bulgaria then disappeared under the blows of the Bulgaroktonos, and in 1118 the Emperor Alexis Commene heard of a physician named Basil, and of his twelve disciples who were preaching a new doctrine. Basil, trapped into telling the full story, was burned at the Hippodrome.[110] It was Bogomilism! Next, in 1140, a Council of Constantinople took note that the heresy was widespread in monasteries.[111] Another Council (August, 1143) condemned two bishops of distant Cappadocia for the same heresy.[112] Shortly after, they damned the leader of the sect, the monk Niphon.[113] Finally, on February 26, 1147, no less than the Patriarch of Constantinople, Cosmas Atticus (1146-47), was produced before a Synod composed of the Emperor Manuel Commene (1143-1180), many imperial dignitaries, 24 metropolitans, 6 archbishops and 1 bishop. He was deposed and sent away.[114]

52. By that time, the Bogomils, Patarenes, Cathari, Paulicians, Publicans—they all meant the same—were everywhere: in 1144 they were at Liége, Belgium, and two years later, at Cologne, where two were executed. In 1179 they filled Europe, though a schism among themselves had scarcely been mended by the Bogomil Council of St. Felix de Caraman, near Toulouse (France), presided over by a Bishop Niquinta (Nikita), whose ordinary residence seems to have been Constantinople.[115] From Bulgaria, the sect spread heavily into Serbia, where Stephen Nemanya, the great zhupan, had rooted it out. It prospered in neighboring Bosnia.

53. The ruler of the country was then Kulin (1168-1204), the Culinus banus of the Papal documents,[116] who was related by marriage to the Nemanyas.[117] This did not keep Vukan of Dalmatia from denouncing him to the Pope: "Bacilinus" (it is *Ban Kulin),* his wife, his sister, and many relatives, and "plus quam decem millia christianorum" have fallen into this heresy.[118] Now, Kulin was a vassal of Hungary.[119] John de Casemarino, who had already been used by Innocent III in the Balkans, was sent to Bosnia and was immediately successful.

There, on the river shore, "in loco qui vocatur Bolino Poily" (the fields of Bolin), a profession of faith was signed by Kulin and seven leaders of the sect.[120] Two of these were then sent to Hungary to pledge their fidelity in the hands of the King, and Kulin swore that he would pay 1,000 marks of silver (half to go to the Pope, half to Hungary) if he were to protect heretics in his lands.[121]

54. He died a Catholic (1204). After his death we know little about what happened, except that heresy prospered in spite of all. By that time, the pope of the sect had established his residence in Bosnia.[122] In 1225 Pope Honorius III (1216-27) sent the Magyars against the Patarenes.[123] In 1236 Pope Gregory IX (1227-41) wrote to Zibislav that he is like a lily among thorns among "principes Bosnensis dioecesis infectos macula haereticae pravitatis."[124] In 1238 Bishop Joannes Teutonicus, O.P., undertook a remarkable apostolate in Bosnia until 1240.[125] Innocent IV (1242-54) had another crusade preached against Bosnia, but by then Bogomilism was getting confused with nationalism.[126] Hence, far greater good was done by the concession of the Slav liturgy,[127] and the sending of Franciscan missionaries who worked through the Balkans from then on with the greatest zeal. In fact, it would be hopeless to write the history of the Catholic Church in Bosnia whilst ignoring the Franciscans.[128] Benedict XII again appealed to Hungary.[129] So did Innocent VI (1352-62).[130] By then, the Bogomils were asking the Turks for aid. When they came, they did nothing to defend their country. "Bosnia fell without a fight. It did not see on its last day a Lazarus, a Milosh, a George Castriota, a Paleologos. The religious quarrels had sapped its strength away. The Patarenes, tired of a long persecution, had called the Turk. But what happened to them, after their country was enslaved? Whilst Catholics and Orthodox remained in spite of foreign domination, the Patarenes disappeared."[131] They became Moslems, they who had called themselves the Christians *par excellence*.

The Turks

55. Before describing the invasion of the Balkans, let us cast a last look at what is left of the Greek empire.

56. The Crusades increased the bitterness between East and West. The Pope's plan had always been to aid the Greek. Even after the murder of the Papal Legate, during the massacre of 1182 (of which it is

difficult to absolve Latin-hater Patriarch Michael Anchialos (1170-1177) who did perhaps more than anyone else to turn the Greek against the Latins,[132] he preferred the Moslems), Innocent III still forbade the Crusaders under pain of excommunication to attack Constantinople.[133] They went ahead, anyhow, took the city and sacked it (April 12-13, 1204). The Byzantine empire broke up into an empire at Nicaea, another at Trebizund, a principality in Epirus, without mentioning the little sovereignties that cropped up pretty much everywhere. Michael VIII Paleologos (1259-1282) took Constantinople again from the Latins (1261), but a great bitterness remained. After 1330 especially, the Byzantine emperors often solicited Western aid against the rising Turks. The Pope countered with proposals of Church unity. The emperors were willing enough. Some churchmen too. But there were others and they carried the day. They rejected the offer and gradually accepted the idea first proposed by Michael Anchialos, that the Turks were less objectionable than the Pope. The West, moreover, had lost its crusading spirit. The princes, engaged in wretched wars against one another, were not interested in the impending doom, and the Papacy had been weakened by the great schism of the West. Few times in history did it appear with greater clearness that Christendom gets chastised for its sins by God's scourges.

57. The Turks entered Europe at the invitation of a Christian prince, John VI Cantacuzen (1341-54), who wanted to oust John V Paleologos (1341-76 and 1379-91) from the throne.[134] In June, 1352, Cantacuzen asked Orkhan (1326-1359) for 20,00 men, promised him a fortress in European Thrace, and plundered the churches of Constantinople to pay him. Orkhan came. He camped in Thrace. On March 2, 1354, an earthquake brought down the walls of Gallipoli. The Turkish soldiers entered the city, considering it as Allah's gift. Orkhan accepted Cantacuzen's ransom money and kept the town. That was the first permanent establishment of the Turks on the European continent.

58. In the meantime, they marauded at will and kept what they took. Eventually, they captured Andrinople (1361) which they never let out of their hands. From then on, Constantinople was cut off from the rest of Europe. Then Orkhan died, and was succeeded by Murad I, who built European Turkey.

59. Murad (1362-1389) developed the organization created by Orkhan: Religious tolerance; only Moslem believers could become sol-

diers; Christians must pay a heavy head tax. Murad also formed the Janizzaries—Christian boys brought up as Moslems. John V Paleologos, who had recovered his throne, had to accept Murad's conquests. He tried to win the Pope over to a Crusade; after a Profession of Faith made on the steps of St. Peter in Rome, he obtained the permission of Urban V (1362-70) to have a portable altar, provided his chaplain said Mass in the Latin Rite. John had become a Latin. The princes of Western Europe were interested in everything except a crusade. Thus, Murad was allowed to forge ahead. In 1369 Bulgar King Shishman had to send his own sister to Murad's harem. Then, Shishman and Murad together drove the Magyars out of Vidin, and the Turks appear for the first time on the Danube. By 1387, in spite of futile rebellions, nearly all the Balkans (except the strip around Constantinople) were in Murad's hands.

60. Lazarus of Serbia, Twrtko of Bosnia, rebelled, beat the Turks at Plosnik (1388) and rebellion flared in the Balkans. On June 15, 1389, 100,000 Christians of seven nations fought the Turks at Kossovo fields. The Turks wavered; Miloš Obilić entered Murad's tent and murdered him. Vuk Branković, Lazarus' son-in-law, fled with 12,000 men when victory was at hand. It was the debacle of Balkan Christendom. The new sultan, Bayezid (1388-1403), began right there on the battlefield by strangling his own brother Yakub, so as to make sure there would be no competition. He tortured Lazarus of Serbia but spared his son Stephen. From then on, Serbs will fight in Bayezid's army as allies. At his court of Serres (spring, 1394) Bayezid appeared as the supreme ruler of the Balkans.

61. A crusade got under way in 1396; Venice cooperated half-heartedly. The land crusade, composed of the most brilliant knights of Europe, stupidly engaged the Turkish infantry at Nicopolis and was crushed (1396). A French army broke through the blockade of Constantinople whilst Emperor Manuel II Paleologos (1391-1425) appealed to the West. He was entertained, feted, received promises, but no aid. In the meantime, Bayezid provoked Timur (Tamerlane) and was beaten at Angora (1402). He died a few months later (1403). Then civil war broke out among his children. The final struggle came with Mura (Europe) opposed to Mohammed (Asia). Mohammed was invited to cross the Bosphoros, and was welcomed by Christians and Moslem alike. Then the Christians, who had missed their chance whilst Bayezid's chil-

dren were engaged in fratricidal war, quarreled among themselves over Dalmatia.

62. Mohammed's reign was short (1413-21); Murad II (1425-1451) intervened in all Balkan affairs. By 1437 his power was absolute. When George Branković dallied in sending his daughter to his harem, he took from him the fortress of Druševać. Family quarrels at Constantinople and the pressure of the Turk persuaded John VIII Paleologos (1425-48) to bring up once more the question of Church reunion.

63. Negotiations began after the fall of Thessalonica (March 29, 1430), but went ahead slowly. The Papacy had suffered from the great schism and the emperor had to negotiate with both Pope and Council. Things dragged on interminably. The religious differences between East and West were thoroughly thrashed out at Ferrara, later at Florence. The Council of Florence became a landmark in Church history. Union was proclaimed on July 6, 1439, but the non-hierarchical opposition in Constantinople proved to be too great. John VIII died October 31, 1448.

64. Murad invaded Transylvania; John Hunyadi, the white knight of Wallachia, defeated him, liberated Belgrade, Nish, Sofia, crossed the Balkans in the dead of winter, and imposed the treaty of Szegetin. Tremendous hopes were raised, only to be shattered when Hungarians, Serbs, Wallachians were routed at Varna. Bréhier blames the Venetians who had loitered in the Mediterranean instead of coming when they would have been of use. Another effort of Hunyadi met with disaster at Kossovo (October 17-20, 1448). Alone, Georges Kastriota (Scanderbeg) continued fighting.

65. Mohammed II (1451-1481) decided to take Constantinople. On December 12, 1452, Papal Legate Isidor of Russia had proclaimed Church union at Hagia Sophia, but the people, excited by Marcos Eugenicos, almost rebelled. The city resisted from February, 1453 to May 29: Out of a population of 100,000 only 6,000 Greek and 3,000 foreigners took part in the fighting. When the city was taken, Mohammed rode straight to Hagia Sofia, accompanied by an iman. He entered the Sanctuary, climbed the altar and trod it under foot. Ever since then Hagia Sophia has been a mosque. For three days the Turkish soldiers enjoyed a Moslem's paradise. The massacre, the plunder, the lust, the madness were ghastly.

66. The Patriarch Gregory Mammas (1443-53) (united to Rome), fled Constantinople for Rome in 1451. Mohammed insisted that a new Patriarch be elected. The choice fell on anti-Roman George Scholarios, who was enthroned, in accordance with the sultan's wish, with traditional magnificence. Religious liberty was granted. The Patriarch was established as the religious and civil head of the Greek "orthodox" nation. Under such a regime, it was advisable to elect a *persona grata* to the Sultan. It took little time to discover that money could aid a patriarchal election. The first to do so seems to have had the appropriate name of Symeon. He offered, in 1466, the sum of 1,000 gold pieces.[135] This put the Patriarchate in the open market. The Turks naturally encouraged the bidding. Hence the patriarchal treasury was emptied and indebted at each election. Nor did an election stop the competition if the rival could raise a sufficient amount.

67. There were two main sources of funds: Rome and Moscow (unless other foreign powers desired to enter into the arrangements). Some turned to Rome out of religious convictions, to heal the break that had brought such misfortune upon their ancient See. Thus, did Cyril Kontaris who died a martyr in 1638. Not a few signed professions of faith. Others showed various degrees of friendliness.[136] It is difficult to appreciate the sincerity of these hard pressed prelates, but it is not encouraging to find the same men on the Moscow lists,[137] nor to confront their anti-Latin utterances with their letters to the Popes. It weakens the Orthodox claim that the East kept the faith without blemish and without hesitation.[138]

68. The internal regime of the Patriarchate consisted of the Patriarch, the Holy Synod, and the Mixed Council. The Patriarch was elected according to the laws approved by the Turkish Government in 1860.[139]

69. When, in the course of the 19th century, the various Balkan nations broke away from the Turkish Empire, and from the Patriarchate, the latter dwindled down to the very modest proportion it holds today. Under the jurisdiction of the Phanar are four metropolitan sees in Turkey: Derkos, Chalcedonia, Imbros and the Islands of Prinkipo. The four metropolitan sees that were, until the recent war, in the Italian Aegean Islands seem to have passed under Greek jurisdiction. There are some 80,000 Greek Orthodox in the Patriarchal territory.

2.

Present Status

Turkey

70. If there is still a European Turkey today, the fact is due to the jealousy of the various powers who wanted a weak nation to stand guard over the straits. Russia is extremely keen to have access to the Mediterranean. Until Poland defeated the Turks at Vienna (1683), no one had been able to interest Moscow in a common effort against the Turk.[140] Almost immediately after that date, Russia posed as the heir of the Crusaders, the savior of Balkan Slavs from the Turks. Of particular interest is the proclamation issued by Peter the Great before the campaign of 1711 under the title: "Justitia armorum quae sacra sua Czarea Majestas Petrus I, Magnae Russiae Imperator, in sui defensionem adversus Turcarum sultanum Achemetem, pacis violatorem arripuit, propalam exposita."[141] From then on, Russia's claim on the Balkans and Constantinople have been insistent, although meeting opposition from Austria, Germany, and especially England. To understand the modern situation of the Balkans, one would have to be informed about the activities of the secret services of the major nations who had interests in those territories. It is startling to think that the Oecumenical Patriarch, whose title to existence is the political position of Constantinople,[142] should still have some authority because of Moslem Turkey. Otherwise the last shred of his ancient splendor would have vanished in the shadow of present parliaments, dictators and politicians.

71. *Orthodox.* The Patriarch of Constantinople resides at the Phanar with his synod. His situation is extremely precarious. Thus, Germanos II was deposed in 1918. His successor Meletios Metaxakis was deposed on July 10, 1923. Gregory VII, elected on December 6, 1923, died on November 17, 1924. Constantine VI, elected on December 17, 1924, was expelled by the Turks on January 30, 1925, no one knew exactly why. Then came Basil III (1926-29), Photios II (elected Octo-

ber 7, 1929), Benjamin I Cristodoulos (1936-1946).[143] His successor, Maximos V, elected on February 21, 1946, left Constantinople towards the end of the same year. Later, he left Turkey.[144] He resigned in 1948. His successor is Athenagoras, formerly metropolitan of the United States. In fact, the greater part of the Patriarch's flock is to be found today in the United States (some 200,000 as against the 80,000 still left in Turkey).

72. The Holy Synod of Constantinople used to have 12 members. Since 1923 it is composed exclusively of Turkish subjects. Now, there are only four metropolitan sees left in European Turkey. Therefore, to keep the appearances of a Synod, it is necessary to maintain a certain number of titular metropolitans. This is not without entailing many problems, financial and others.

73. *Catholic.* The Catholics of the Latin Rite, established in Constantinople, are the descendants of the ancient traders who established themselves in the city. They are under the jurisdiction of the Apostolic Delegate who is Vicar Apostolic for the Latins.

74. There is also a small Catholic community of the Greek Rite which began in the year 1856. A Greek from the island of Sira, by the name of John Marango (1825-85), founded a newspaper to discuss the problem of Church unity. He won over two Orthodox bishops, and others. A school was opened and two religious communities, one for men, one for women, were established. In 1882 a movement for unity began in the town of Malgara, in Thrace, which gained neighboring villages. In 1911 Pope Pius X created a Catholic Ordinariate of the Greek Rite for Turkey and placed at its head Kyr Isaiah Papadopoulos, consecrated titular bishop of Grazianopolis. In 1920 Bishop George Calavassy succeeded him, and when the Greeks were transferred from Thrace to Greece, Bishop George followed them to Athens (1923) leaving behind him as his Vicar for Constantinople and Turkish territories Msgr. Dennis Varoukhas, who was consecrated bishop in 1932.[145] In 1945 the Exarchate of Constantinople had: 1 bishop, 2 priests, 3 seminarians, 1,494 faithful, a pro-Cathedral (Holy Trinity), a Conference of St. Vincent de Paul, the Children of Mary Society, a Young People's Circle with 50 members, a young choral and acolyte society, and a school (Our Lady Odighitria) with 147 students (82 Catholics, 63 dissident, 1 Jew).[146]

75. A Catholic diocese of the Armenian Rite has: 1 bishop, 15

priests, 15 churches or chapels, 7 schools with 822 students of whom 220 are Catholic.[147]

Greece

76. The more recent statistical data on Greece (1928; still quoted in *The Statesman's Year Book*, 1948), are as follows:

Orthodox	5,961,529
Moslem	126,017
Jews	72,791
Catholic	35,182
Protestant	9,003

77. The dissident (Orthodox) Church of Greece is autocephalous. When the movement for independence began in 1821, Patriarch Gregory of Constantinople, obviously under Turkish pressure, excommunicated the leaders of the rebellion.[148] He was hung shortly after, together with several members of his synod. New elections were held at the Phanar, and as soon as the new administration was enthroned seven Greek bishops who had taken part in the rebellion were excommunicated.[149] In Greece, the insurgents called together a reunion of bishops (March 4, 1822), which could not be held on account of the war. Religious issues were studied at each annual National Assembly. In 1828 a Commission was formed to take care of church matters. The situation throughout Greece was reported to be lamentable. An important reunion was held at Nauhplion, April-May, 1828, which prepared for the King's signature the Katastikón or Constitution of the Greek Church. It was largely the work of a Protestant layman named Maurer. The Greek Church, built along lines similar to Peter the Great's Russian establishment, recognized Christ as its invisible head, accepted no visible authority outside of Greece, acknowledged as its visible head a Holy Synod under the authority of the King.[150]

78. On May 30, 1850, the Greek Government asked Patriarch Anthimos of Constantinople to give official recognition to the *fait accompli* of 22 years before. Unable to do much else, the Patriarch tried to strike the best bargain he could, and on June 29/July 11, 1850 the Greek Church was recognized as autocephalous.[151]

79. Until 1922 there was only one metropolitan See: Athens. The others were just bishops. After the Balkan wars (1912-1913) a considerable number of metropolitan sees were annexed from Turkey. In

1922 a frightful exodus of over 1,000,000 Greeks left Asia Minor after the disaster of Smyrna. As a certain number of metropolitans came with them it happened that the number of new bishops (those of the recently annexed territories in Macedonia) who were theoretically under the Patriarch's jurisdiction, and the displaced metropolitans from Asia Minor considerably outnumbered the Greek bishops. Moreover, they were all metropolitans, whereas the Greek were only bishops. The structure of the Greek Church had to be reorganized. On July 10, 1928, the Greek Parliament voted the reunion of the Macedonian and other patriarchal churches which were now in Hellenic territory to the Greek autocephaly. The Phanar agreed under certain conditions, the principal one being that the Greek administration be considered as provisional.[152]

80. Then, the entire Church received a new Constitution by the law of July 21, 1931. All the bishops were to receive the title of metropolitan, except the one of Athens, who was to be called alone an archbishop. This terminology, in the Oriental Rite, was new.[153]

81. The supreme power in the Greek Church is held by the Holy Synod of the Hierarchy, an assembly of the Metropolitan Bishops (32 from the Patriarchal territories, 32 from Greece proper). It meets once every three years. It can ask permission of the Civil Government to meet on other occasions, but the Government may refuse the permission. All the acts of the Holy Synod of the Hierarchy must be approved by the Minister of Public Instruction and Cults.

82. Between these triennal assemblies, the Church is governed by a Synod of nine members: the Archbishop of Athens, who is president, *ex officio,* 4 Metropolitans from Greece, and 4 from Patriarchal territories, i.e., the parts of Macedonia and Thrace that were annexed by Greece after the first world war. All but the Archbishop of Athens are changed every year. They succeed one another in order of seniority. A Government commissary assists at the reunions as observer. He no longer has the power of veto. He signs the acts and decisions, which have force of law even though he protests them. His protests, however, must be entered in the minutes. The number of metropolitan sees will be somewhat diminished after some of the incumbents die.[154]

83. Though in Greek territory, Mount Athos [155] is still governed as an independent monastic republic under the immediate jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople.[156] It has 20 principal monasteries, 17 Greek, 1 Serb (Khilandar), 1 Bulgarian (Zographos), 1 Russian (Rossicon, or St. Panteleimon. The monastery of Iviron, formerly consid-

ered as Georgian, must be classed today among the Greek). There are also 12 "skite," or monasteries of inferior rank, though they have at times a great number of monks. Thus, the Russian *skite* of St. Andrew had, some years ago, some 400 monks. After the *skite* come the cells, numbering 204. Finally, there are 456 "hermitages." The last complete available statistics were those of 1913, made shortly after about 1,000 Russian monks had been expelled for heresy. At the time there were 6,345 monks on the Holy Mountain, 3,742 in the 20 monasteries, 1,043 in the 12 *skites,* 893 in the 204 cells and 667 in the 456 hermitages. According to nationality, they were: 3,243 Greeks, 1,914 Russians, 379 Rumanians, 706 Bulgarians, 89 Serbians and Montenegrans, and 14 Georgians. In 1926 the number had dwindled to 4,858, of whom 464 were Russian.[157] Writing in 1937, André Billy speaks of "three thousand monks."[158] The number has probably dwindled since then. All the monks are considered today as Greek citizens.

84. The Republic is governed by a counsel of 20 monks, one elected from each major monastery. This gives to the Greek element 17 out of 20 votes. For current affairs, the Council delegates its power to a commission of four "epistatoi," chosen as follows. The 20 major monasteries are subdivided in five groups of four. Each year one of the groups elects the four "superintendents," one of whom, the "protepistatos," becomes the head of the Government. His power, however, is limited by tradition and the various subtle ways human ingenuity has discovered to limit authority. The commission meets three times a week.[159] It would be outside the scope of this study to describe the manifold aspects of the monastic spirituality. The monasteries of Athos have been very rich in the past. In recent times, the various Governments of the countries where they had property have impaired this wealth. The library of Mount Athos is still the great joy of the fortunate scholars who have access to its manuscripts.[160]

85. The Latin Hierarchy of Greece was reorganized in 1947. The Archdiocese of Athens has for territory all Greece proper (except Epirus) with 30,000 Catholics. The Archdiocese of Corfù, Zante and Cephalonia takes care of Epirus and the adjacent islands. Its Catholic population, in 1940, comprised 4,221, taken care of by 13 priests, 17 Religious, and 44 nuns. In 1947, after the war and the expulsion of Italians, there remained 2,700 persons, 6 secular priests, 1 Capuchin, and 10 nuns. A third archdiocese comprises the islands of Naxos, Andros, Tina and Micone with 4,200 Catholics. In due time, it was an-

nounced, bishops will be provided for the dioceses of Sira and Santorin (7,988 Catholics), Chio (400 Catholics) and Candia or Crete (368 Catholics). Also there will be a bishop for the apostolic vicariate of Salonika.[161]

86. The small Catholic community of the Greek Rite, with Bishop Georges Calavassy at its head, had a difficult existence. When the Greek Catholics of the Byzantine Rite, who lived in Thrace, were displaced into Greece, after the Convention of Neuilly sur Seine (November 27, 1919), Bishop Georges left Constantinople and established himself at Athens to tend to their needs (1923). Sometime later, when the dissident Archbishop of Athens, Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, was insulted in the streets by a mob who did not wish to accept the Gregorian calendar, Bishop Georges wrote to him a letter of sympathy, and brought up the subject of Church unity.[162] It took only a short time before the polemics became extremely violent and there was danger that Bishop Georges, though a Greek citizen, would be driven out of the country, in spite of the liberty of worship granted by the Greek Constitution. After much agitation in the press and deliberation in Parliament, the following paragraph was entered into the law of July 21, 1931:

> Art. 15. No secular person, nor cleric, nor unfrocked monk, nor cleric who does not belong to the Oriental Orthodox Church may wear, outside of religious ceremonies and on the territory of the State, the garb and the holy vestments worn by the clerics of the Oriental Orthodox Church, as determined by the Presidential decree of Jan. 21, 1931 "On the canonical costume of the Greek Orthodox clergy," as well as the distinctive signs prescribed by the royal decree of June 15, 1856. If he is not a Hellene, the delinquent shall be expelled beyond the borders of the State. If he is a citizen, he shall be summoned by competent authority before the correctional court, and prosecuted according to Art. 228 and 229 of the penal code. Besides the prison, to which he may be condemned, he shall pay a fine of from 10,000 to 200,000 drachmas.[163]

87. Thus, Bishop Georges Calavassy, though a Greek and belonging to a Greek Rite as ancient as Christian Greece, could not wear the garment of his calling. He had no inclination whatsoever to put on a Latin cassock, for an Easterner dislikes very strongly to appear as a Latin, and in this he obeys the prescriptions of the Popes who insist that each should keep his Rite in all purity.[164] Therefore, Bishop Calavassy and his priests walked the streets of Athens in the clerical dress familiar to British and American citizens. When he leaves Greece, however, there is nothing on earth to stop him from putting on the Greek garb.

88. In 1938 the number of this little group, which observes its Rite with great purity, was about 1,000. It had nine priests who were all

Greek citizens. All were celibate. The Greek parish of Lyons (France) also belonged to this diocese.[165]

Albania

89. When Georges Kastriota, better known as Scanderbeg, died in 1467 after a heroic struggle against the Turks, his country was almost entirely Catholic. Not a few Albanians came over to Italy and settled in Calabria and Sicily.[166] About 150 years later a correspondent stated that 30 per cent of the population was already Moslem.[167] Soon, Greek dissidents made inroads on the Catholic flock. When the recent war broke out, the population of Albania was reported thus:

Moslems	688,280
Orthodox	210,313
Catholic	104,184

90. Nearly all these Catholics belonged to the Latin Rite, and their dioceses (Dyrrachium, Scodra, etc.) were among the most ancient of Illyricum. They had resisted heroically the pressure of Moslem and Orthodox.

91. In 1922 the *Orthodox* Church of Albania broke away from the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The movement was started in the United States. An Albanian Orthodox (i.e., dissident) priest named Fan Noli had been elected by the Albanians of America to be their bishop, but he found no one to consecrate him on account of the opposition of the Patriarchate. This did not stop him from pontificating both in the United States and in Albania, until he became President of the Government in 1924. When Ahmed Zoghu achieved his revolution, Fan Noli quietly disappeared.

92. A more important movement was initiated at the National Orthodox Congress of Berat (September, 1922) under the leadership of the priest Basil Marcu, or At Bassil, who declared his church autocephalous. Nothing much happened until two Albanian bishops, one sent by the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Metropolitan Hierotheos of Melitopolis, and another who came on his own initiative, partially sided with At Bassil. They wanted above all to use Albanian as a liturgical language, and to have an autonomous clergy. Negotiations dragged on till 1927, became very complicated, until the Government took matters into hand. The Government asked the cooperation of one Vissarion Giovanni, an Albanian priest who had been consecrated bishop by Rus-

sian emigrés in 1925 at Cattaro, and of a Serbian bishop, Victor Simis, who was then residing at Scodra (Scutari). The solemn consecration of three bishops took place on February 12, 1929.

93. The Phanar was incensed. He declared the autocephaly null and void, annulled the constitution of the Holy Synod, deposed and unfrocked its members, as well as At Bassil who was at the root of all the trouble. Then both parties tried to win the support of the sister autocephalous churches. Eventually, silence covered up the whole matter. Albania remained autocephalous, while Constantinople stood aloof.[168]

94. In 1923 the Moslems broke away from the Caliphate and set up an establishment of their own. Shortly before World War II, on Good Friday in 1939, Mussolini attacked Albania. This did not enhance the popularity of Catholic missionaries, the majority of whom were Italians. The last group of Catholic Sisters to leave Albania were three small Catholic religious communities of the Albanian Rite at Elbasani, Korça and Vlora (Valona).[169] They were Basilian Sisters of St. Macrina who had come over from Mezzoiuso in Sicily and taken care of the hospital at Argyrocastro. The last five Sisters left their Albanian home on April 19, 1946—Good Friday.[170] Albania is today behind the Iron Curtain.

Bulgaria

95. According to the *Bulletin Mensuel de Statistique*, 1937,[171] the population of Bulgaria was thus divided according to religion:

Population	6,077,939
Orthodox	5,128,298
Moslem	821,298
Catholic	45,704
Protestant	8,371
Jewish	43,398
Armenian Gregor.	23,476
Other	1,802

96. The bulk of the Catholic population belonged to the Latin Rite. They are the descendants of the Paulicians or Bogomils brought into the Church by the zealous activity of Fra Pietro Salinate, O.F.M. and his collaborators in the 16th and 17th centuries.[172] They are to be found in the two Apostolic Vicariates of Nicopolis, and of Sofia and Philippopolis. In the first, there were, in 1930, 16,500 Catholics: in

the second, there were 24,500.[173] When Bishop Bossilkoff was raised to the See of Nicopolis on August 31, 1947, his diocese (Nicopolis) numbered 21,730 Catholics, all of the Latin Rite. The increase over 1930 is startling enough when we realize how troubled the war years were for Bulgaria.[174]

97. The small Catholic population of the Byzantine Rite, about 6,000,[175] has an interesting history. One day, in July, 1859, a group of Macedonian Bulgarians, from the town of Kukuč in the hinterland of Salonika, asked to be received into the Catholic Church. They were tired of the oppression of the Phanar which, since the suppression of the Patriarchate of Ochrida in 1767, had become unbearable to their rising nationalism.[176] The Phanar promptly sent to the locality a Bulgarian bishop it held in readiness for emergencies, and the peril was allayed for the time being. In December, 1860, a large group of Constantinople Bulgarians presented themselves at the Apostolic Delegation, and asked to be readmitted in the Catholic Church. Msgr. Paolo Brunoni summoned for the occasion Armenian Archbishop Hassun, and all the Catholic pastors or Superiors of Constantinople. Those 200 Bulgarians presented a petition with some 2,000 signatures. They made a profession of faith, and were given a house and chapel. They asked that their Rites and language be kept: "according to the council of Florence" as well as "our national hierarchy and our national clergy who alone minister to us."[177] Their primary motive was nationalism. Some said that the Phanar was taking too much money from the Bulgarian parishes. This was not true, for each year the Patriarchate had to make good a deficit from these poorer regions. The Phanar wished to keep, for reasons of its own, an influence that the Bulgarians preferred to do without. In due time, a delegation was sent to Rome, headed by Archimandrite Joseph Sokolski, who was destined to become Catholic Bulgaria's first bishop. On April 14, 1861, the Bulgarian monk was consecrated by Pope Pius IX in person. The Latin Rite was used for the Mass of consecration, a translation had been made in Palaeoslav for the occasion, and while the Pope read the prayers in Latin, Joseph Sokolski read them in the language of his Church. "In order to keep the Eastern Rite as much as possible, the gloves were not given him, and the mitre and crozier adopted had the Greek form."[178] On April 19 Pope Pius IX sent back the new Bishop to Bulgaria as his Apostolic Vicar.

98. He was triumphantly received at Constantinople on April 27 and was given an imperial bérat for "the Bulgarians . . . who had become united to the Catholic Church." [179]

99. Then the aged bishop began making the rounds of the various embassies where he was received with the courtesy due to his dignity. He called on the Russian, Prince Lobanov, who was away, however, at his country-house at Buyuk-déré, on the Bosphorus. Bishop Sokolski went there and had a long visit with the Ambassador. Then, he went to the Russian ship that was waiting under steam before the Russian villa, and the boat left for Odessa. Did he go of his own free will? Was he deceived? Were there promises, threats? According to the *Courrier d'Orient* (August 24, 1861), when some Bulgarian students of the Seminary at Odessa asked him why he had left Constantinople, "his eyes filled with tears, and he said that he had been unworthily deceived: 'I am in iron hands.'" [180] Later, he was brought to Kiev where he lived on a pension paid to him by the Russian Government.

100. Sometime later when Tsarist Russia decided to impose dissident orthodoxy on the Catholic population of the last diocese of the Greek Rite of Chelm, Bishop Sokolski was brought over to perform the necessary ordinations.[181] The Russian authorities must have considered him, therefore, to be a Catholic. The old bishop was then 89 years of age. After that, nothing is known of him. At any rate, the Bulgarian mass movement towards Rome was effectively blocked. One is not sure that it was for the greater good of immediate Russian politics—let alone of the spiritual interests of the poor people who were humbly seeking Christ.[182]

101. After the experiences of Bishop Sokolski, it was difficult to provide another Catholic bishop of Bulgarian nationality. The movement for reunion followed an irreguiar course. Eventually, an Apostolic Administrator was established at Sofia with the title of Exarch. The present incumbent, since 1941, is Bishop John Garufaloff.[183]

102. When the Bulgarian movement towards Rome was defeated, Russian efficient if underhand influence turned Bulgarian ecclesiastical nationalism towards autocephaly. In 1860 the Bulgarian clergy of Constantinople ceased commemorating the Patriarch in the liturgy. The battle between the Bulgarians and the Phanar grew to such intensity that conciliation became impossible. On February 23, 1872, the National Assembly elected Bishop Hilarion as its Exarch, and the Phanar countered with a condemnation of the entire Bulgarian Church for

phyletism, i.e., racialism. Its bishops were deposed, and communion was broken. The principle of phyletism is different from that of autocephaly. Autocephaly means that once a country achieved political independence, it is entitled to have ecclesiastical autonomy; whereas phyletism claims that national groups in the same State have a right to churches of their own. If, at the beginning, the Phanar had given Bulgarians their own pastors and bishops of their own language where they were in the majority—in the same way as Catholic parishes have been established for various language groups in the United States—schism might have been avoided. At any rate, the Bulgarians became more and more stubborn as they gained their points and felt Russian support. Constantinople, after condemning them, tried to get the aid of the other autocephalies. The Patriarch of Jerusalem, though condemning phyletism generally, was absent from the Synod when it pronounced an anathema against the Bulgarians. At that particular moment he was receiving the Russian Grand-Duke Nicholas.[184] A peculiar situation developed. Bulgaria and Constantinople were in schism, while Constantinople remained in communion with the other autocephalies, and Bulgaria was in communion with them also, with the exception of Greece. This lasted until February, 1945 when, through the good offices of Soviet Patriarch Alexis, reconciliation was finally achieved between Sofia and the Phanar, and communion restored.

103. Shortly after the establishment of the Exarchate, rebellion against the Turks broke out in the Balkans (1875). It was followed so rapidly by a Russian war against the Turks that one doubts the spontaneity of the Macedonian insurrection. The Russians were victorious and imposed on the Turks the treaty of Stan Stefano (1879) which restored the Great Bulgaria of Boris and Symeon. The other European powers protested, and at the Congress of Berlin, Bulgaria was whittled down almost to insignificance. The Dobrugea was handed to Rumania; Western Rumelia was made an independent principality (until 1885, when it was reunited to Bulgaria). Macedonia was given back to the Turks who in turn promised freedom of conscience. The disappointment of Bulgarians was indescribable. At once began the insurrection of the IMRO (Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization), better known under the Turkish name of *Comitadjis*.[185] From then on, insurrections, atrocities, appeals to the world followed unabated. In 1912, after the failure of the Young Turks to make good their promises, all the Balkan nations rose in arms. But as soon as they had defeated

the Turks, they fought between themselves. Greece and Serbia, with the later participation of Rumania, vanquished Bulgaria, which remained extremely bitter against the rest of the Balkans ever since. Thus in the two world wars Bulgaria was on the German side, whereas the other Balkan nations fought with the Allies.

104. The Treaty of Bucharest divided Macedonia between Greece and Serbia. Greece settled its Macedonian problem by shipping back to Bulgaria all Slav Macedonians (except those that were in absolutely safe localities) and bringing the Greeks over from Bulgaria. The Macedonian problem weighs heavily on Yugoslav internal policy. The last act of the drama has not yet been played.

105. A King was provided for the Bulgarians in 1887 in the person of Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, a Catholic. To conciliate the Orthodox, his son Boris became one of them. Later, when Boris decided to marry, he wed the daughter of Vittorio Emmanuele of Italy, Princess Giovanna di Savoia, at Assisi in Italy. In spite of promises solemnly given to the Pope, Boris had his marriage blessed once more at Sofia by the Orthodox, and the following year, Queen Elena's train was delayed at the Bulgarian border for a day until Giovanna's baby had been baptized in the Orthodox cathedral. Such were the means used to defeat the Catholics. They seem futile in the light of what happened since then.

106. Today, Bulgaria is behind the Iron Curtain. Theoretically, the Bulgarian Church is still autocephalous, just as Bulgaria is still independent. When Moscow healed the seventy-five year old schism that had kept Sofia and Constantinople apart (1945), a Bulgarian Church Delegation went to Moscow and was splendidly received. Then, Patriarch Alexis in person came to return the visit. He was received by Church and civil authorities. There was a particularly splendid Mass on May 26, 1946, at the monastery of St. John Rylski. Among the persons present were the "Regent" of the "Kingdom," M. V. Ganev, the Soviet Ambassador and Ambassadress, the president of the Russian Red Cross and Half Moon, then the Bulgarians, the Prime Minister, K. Georgiev, seven Ministers including the Minister of Cults (it is interesting to note the presence of a "Minister of Cults" in the Government of countries where there is separation of Church and State), and several others, such as Georgi Dimitrov, the famed ex-President of the Komintern, who was quite noticeable for his striking features and the reverence he showed at Mass. Shortly before, he had also attended at a solemn office of Thanksgiving, and a reception. He exhorted the Bul-

garian clergy to "go to the people and cooperate with the Government to raise the people and country to a higher level." Rarely indeed in capitalist countries may one observe such a close alliance of Church and State.[186]

Yugoslavia

107. The statistics of 1931 give the following religious picture:

Orthodox	6,785,501
Roman Catholic	5,217,847
Greek Catholic	44,671
Protestant	231,169
Moslem	1,561,166
Jews	68,405
Other	25,279

108. When Yugoslavia was created at the close of the first world war, it received the name of "Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes," representing the fusion of the three chief nationalities that made the new State. The other groups (Dalmatia, Bosnia, Montenegro, Bačka, etc.) linked themselves with either Serb or Croat according to religion.

109. During the centuries of Turkish domination, the Serbs had been accustomed to consider their church as the sign of their nationality. Much as they disliked the Turks, they perhaps hated the Latins even more. They drove into Orthodoxy many Latins from Bosnia and Herzegovina.[187] At the beginning of the 19th century, the Serbs began a long twenty year war against the Turks. The treaties of Akkerman (1826) and Andrinople (1829) consecrated their autonomy. After the Congress of Berlin (1879), Serbia achieved independence. It was overwhelmingly Greek dissident.

110. Croatia, after a glorious history in the Middle Ages, had freely accepted Austrian rule in 1527 and achieved a large measure of autonomy under the Hapsburgs in 1868. Ever since the Turks had settled in the Balkans, proud Croatia fought them so steadily and brilliantly that it deserved, like Poland, to be called *antemurale Christianitatis,* the bulwark of Christendom. Croatia was highly cultured. It spoke the same language as Serbia, though with a different alphabet. Slovenia, a smaller country to the west, was one of the most cultured little spots of Europe.

111. During the war of 1914-1918, Serbia had been on the side of the Allies, whereas Croatia fought with Austria. When Yugoslavia

was created, centralized Serbia expected to extend its domination to Croatia; Croatia, on the other hand, was used to federalism. The religious opposition between the two groups was bitter. Given a little sympathetic consideration, the Croats might have cooperated. They received none whatsoever.

112. Prior to the Balkan wars and the creation of Yugoslavia, the dissidents belonged to five groups: a) the Patriarchate of Karlovci, begun in 1690, when some 30,000 families led by Patriarch Arsenij III of Peč fled from Turkish domination to lower Hungary; b) the Metropolitan Church of Cetinje (Montenegro); c) the two dioceses of Dalmatia, more or less dependent upon the Metropolitan See of Czernowitz (today Cernauti in Rumania); d) the four dioceses of Bosnia and Herzegovina, nominally under the jurisdiction of the Phanar; e) the Synodal Church of Belgrade.[188] This latter organization was to extend its centralization to the rest. It may be useful to recall its immediate background.

113. When Serbia won autonomy, at the beginning of the 19th century, Prince Miloš Obrenovič began emancipating the Church from the Phanar. After some negotiation, he obtained the right for the Serbs to elect their own bishops, though they still had to go to Constantinople to receive canonical investiture. Thus, in 1831, Meletius Pavlovič, who had been drum-major in the war of independence, went to Constantinople to become Belgrade's first metropolitan. Until 1879 the Serbian Church was governed by a convention made between Belgrade and the Phanar. After the Congress of Berlin and total political independence, Prince Milan Obrenovič obtained autocephaly for the Church.

114. The unification of the five groups mentioned above was achieved in 1920, when the Patriarch of Karlovci died and was not given a successor. That same year, in March, Constantinople renounced all its rights over the part of Macedonia that had been transferred to Serbia. On June 30 was proclaimed the union of all the groups in a national church. On November 12 the first Patriarch to the restored See of Peč was elected. Two royal decrees (December 13 and 14, 1920—later amended by the ukase of November 9, 1929)[189] gave its constitution to the Serbian church.

115. *Greek Rite Catholics.* A group of Serbs (Rascians), after the Turkish invasion, migrated to the North and settled in the mountains between Croatia and Slovenia. In 1611 their bishop Simon Vretanič came to Rome, made his profession of faith, was re-consecrated under condition by St. Robert Bellarmine.[190] He returned as a Vicar for Orien-

tals of the Latin Archbishopric of Zagreb. After his death (1630), the Austrian emperor named his successor Maxim Predojević who, instead of going to Rome, ran off to Pec. This was continued until 1671 with ensuing difficulties between Catholic and Orthodox. Since then, however, the bishops of Križevci have remained in union with Rome and exercised their ministry in peace. At the time of Tito's coming to power, there were some 41,597 Catholics of the Greek Rite in the diocese, belonging to the following groups: a) the descendents of the old Rascians (about 13,000); b) Carpathorussians who were brought thither in the days of Maria Theresa; c) Ukrainians from Galicia who began to migrate in Slovenia and Bosnia around 1900; d) Rumanians from the part of the district of Timisoara which was given to Yugoslavia; e) Macedonians from the districts of Strumica and Gevgelia. All of these, barring the Rumanians who use their own language, use Slav as their liturgical language. The last bishop of the diocese, Dr. Janko Simrak, died on August 9, 1946, in consequence of the harsh treatments received in the various prisons of the OZNA.[191]

116. *Catholic and Orthodox relations.* At the end of the 19th century there were no more than some 8,000 Catholics in all Serbia. They were considered as foreigners and were supported by Austrian aid. In 1884 Pope Leo XIII endeavored to reach an accord with King Milan Obrenovič, so as to emancipate these Catholics from Austria. The King immediately saw that this was to the advantage of Serbia and met the idea with favor, although he observed that anti-Roman prejudice was much too strong to make any headway. This was unfortunately true.

117. After the Balkan wars, King Peter Karageorgević obtained for Serbia a considerable part of Macedonia—the Vardar region, where there was the Catholic diocese of Skoplje (Uskub) with some 15,000 Catholics. It was imprudent for Serbia to allow Austria to reach directly such an important population in a new and turbulent territory. Negotiations were carried on in Rome—on the Papal side were Cardinal Merry del Val and Msgr. Eugenio Pacelli, now Pope Pius XII. A concordat was signed on June 24, 1914. It was the first of what might be called the modern type of concordat—that would become so numerous in the days of Pope Pius XI.[192]

118. The world war brought huge territories to Serbia. Well over one-third of the population was now Catholic. It was obvious that some sort of juridical status had to be made for them; nevertheless, the opposition became far more acute than it had been formerly. The

Serbs would yield nothing whatsoever to the Croats, lest the balance of power be tipped. The antagonism grew until the leader of the Croat party, Radić, was murdered in Parliament (1928). King Alexander established a provisional dictatorship (1929), and scrapped the name of "King of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes" for that of "Kingdom of Yugoslavia." In 1931 a new, totalitarian Constitution was promulgated. It was forbidden to have political parties named after territorial divisions. Hence the Croat Party could only be called the Peasant Party. The Croats chafed more and more at a Serbian centralism that had become ruthless. The more violent wing among them formed the "Ustashis." They allied themselves to the ever-restless Macedonians of the IMRO, and murdered King Alexander at Marseilles on October 9, 1934. Little could be done after that to bring together Serbs and Croats. On July 25, 1935, a concordat was finally concluded between Yugoslavia and the Holy See. Barring a few minor details that gave satisfaction to the nationalist element (there was to be no competition to the Sokols and Slav was authorized in the Catholic liturgy for some localities), it was a repetition of the concordat of 1914. This time the Serbs would not allow Catholics to obtain legal status. It had to be Serbian totalism, lest Croats lift their heads. Violent agitation broke out in the streets and in the press. In spite of all, the concordat was passed in the lower house. But resentment rose to such heights that the Senate did not dare to approve it.[193] The war of 1939 found Yugoslavia internally torn asunder.

119. Mihailović organized his brilliant resistance, and kept many German divisions away from the Russian front. But he was a Serb! Italy gave Croatia the status of a Kingdom, and the head of Ustashis, Ante Pavelić, became Prime Minister. Tito used whatever Croat sentiment he could muster in an all-out effort against the Serbs and Mihailović. He was able to sell to the Western Allies the idea that he, and he alone, represented the common war effort of Yugoslavia. Milhailović was first abandoned, then caught, arrested, tried, executed. We know the rest.

120. Slovenia, under German invasion, suffered frightfully. The Croats managed somewhat better until the day of awful reckoning came. Tito encouraged religion until he was firmly established. More than one Corpus Christi procession was reverently escorted by armed Red partisans. Once in the saddle, however, Tito promptly established a system to the image and likeness of the Soviet: one-party-popular-

democracy, ubiquitous police (OZNA), collectivization of the land, planned economy, Intourism for sympathetic strangers, Committees in the U. S. A. to publicize the "brilliant successes" of the new regime.

121. Then the entire Catholic school system was suppressed. Later, hospitals, orphan asylums, old-folks' homes were nationalized.[194] By 1947 about a hundred newspapers or other Catholic publications had been "liquidated." Agrarian reform was driven to extreme lengths. Thus, a garden that was between the Bishop's palace, the cathedral and the seminary of Zagreb was nationalized and became the trysting-place where lonely *partisans* sought solace—to the scandal of the people who came to church. Archbishop Stepinac suppressed the organizations of Catholic Action, to avoid reprisals.

122. According to a circular letter of the Bishops of Yugoslavia (September 29, 1945), 243 priests had already been murdered, 89 had vanished, 169 were in concentration camps. By 1947 about 400 priests had been killed in Croatia alone (one-sixth). In other dioceses the proportion was higher.

123. When Tito tried Archbishop Stepinac, he did not have the technique that has been developed since and applied to His Eminence Cardinal Mindszenty. When asked to sign a petition for mercy, the Archbishop answered:

> I shall never abandon my people, neither as a prisoner of this jail, nor as a free man in my residence. At most, I can ask for a new trial; but this time, I must be judged not by the Communist Party but by the people in Jelacić square. I am not afraid to face the judgment of my Croat people, in the centre of Zagreb.

124. Since June 29, 1948, Tito has been at odds with Soviet Russia. So far, there has been no change whatsoever in his attitude towards the Catholic Church. The persecution is as violent as ever. As to the Orthodox, the Patriarch of Serbia, Gabriel, was present at Moscow at the Synod of July, 1948, that launched a world-wide offensive against the Pope.[195]

Rumania

125. Rumania, the only nation observing the Byzantine Rite in a Latin tongue, was left undiscussed in the first part of our study, which dealt almost exclusively with Greeks and Slavs.

126. When Trajan conquered Dacia, at the beginning of the 2nd century, he settled the country with farmers brought over from Italy.

They were defended by the XIIIth Roman legion until the year 270 when the barbarian pressure obliged Aurelian to bring the soldiers back. The settlers remained, went into the mountains, became shepherds, and kept their language. The Gospel spread throughout the country. The See of Costanza, south of the Danube, (then called Tomi) was famous in antiquity. The Gospel also crossed the Danube and the tradition has it that Rumania's (transdanubian) apostle was St. Nikita, Bishop of Remesiana (near Niš, in Serbia), a much traveled man to whom has been attributed, among many other writings, the *Te Deum*.[196]

127. In time, Rumania fell under the sway of the Bulgarians, accepted Slav as its liturgical language, though the people kept their Latin tongue. We told elsewhere how John and Peter Assen, two Rumanians, became the heroes of the Bulgarian renaissance in the 12th and 13th centuries. Shortly after, we hear of Latin bishoprics established among the Moldavians or Moldavo-Wallachians for the barbarian Cumans who had accepted Christianity.[197] In 1359 Prince Nicholas Alexander obtained from Patriarch Calixtus I (1355-63) of Constantinople a Metropolitan for the Ungro-Wallachians. From then on, we see Rumanians exercising considerable influence among the Ruthenians. Several metropolitans favored union with Rome. Thus, Gregory Tsamblak who came to the council of Constance, Damian who came to Florence and signed the Act of Union, and Joachim.[198]

128. After the Turkish invasion, Michael the Brave (1593-1601) achieved for a short, but unforgettable time, the unity of his country. He drove the Turks out of Wallachia (1595), annexed Transylvania (1599), Moldavia (1600) and was assassinated the following year. Moldavia and Wallachia fell back to the Turks who let Rumanian princes govern and collect taxes for them. Transylvania was administered by Hungarian princes, likewise for Turkish benefit, until the Peace of Karlowitz (1699) gave it definitely to the Habsburgs.

129. After the first war with Russia (1711-16), where Rumanians sided with Peter the Great, the Sultan no longer allowed Rumanian princes to become the "hospodars" or princes of Moldavia and Wallachia; Greeks were sent to them from Constantinople, and they became unpopular. As Turkey weakened, Russian influence became ever stronger and more unbearable until the Crimean War. The Congress of Paris (1856) gave autonomy under the Sultans to Moldavia and Wallachia which were kept separate, but the Rumanians turned the difficulty by electing Prince Cuza as sovereign of both. At his overthrow (1866),

Charles of Hohenzollern, a Catholic who translated his name into Carol, was called to Rumania. After the Congress of Berlin (1879) when Moldavia and Wallachia finally united, he assumed the title and dignity of King. Transylvania was returned to Rumania in 1919 over the protest of Hungary, and Rumania was united for the first time in its history, except for the meteoric year of Michael the Brave.

Religious statistics:

The census of 1930 give the following data: [199]

Rumanians	13,160,000
Magyars	1,388,000
Jews	822,000
Germans	770,000
Ukrainians	469,000
Bulgarians	378,000
Russians	324,000
Turks	235,000
Orthodox (dissident)	13,067,000
Catholic Rumanian Rite	1,350,000
Catholic Latin Rite	1,200,000
Calvinist	700,000
Lutheran	360,000
Unitarian (anti-trinitarian)	72,000
Jews	984,000
Moslems	234,000
Armenian (Gregorian)	60,000
Other	82,000

130. It is worth observing the discrepancy between racial and religious statistics, particularly in the case of Jews, where the difference is great. This probably springs from the fact that many Jews like to count themselves as citizens of the country where they are. This tendency grows as time goes on, especially in Eastern Europe.

Catholics of the Rumanian Rite

131. When Leopold I drove the Turks from Transylvania, the Jesuit chaplains of his army tended to the Latins, abandoned for so long! They also won the friendship of the dissident Rumanian Bishop, Theophilos Szeremi. In 1696 the annual assembly of the Rumanian clergy, having received the promise that their Rite would be kept in the Rumanian

language, came over to Rome. The movement for reunion grew, especially under Bishop Athanasius (1693-1713). As the Transylvanian Parliament, at the time, was in great majority Calvinist, the declaration of the Synod of 1700, signed by the bishop and 54 deans, representing 1,582 priests and some 200,000 faithful acquired, under the circumstances, a tremendous importance:

> We, undersigned, bishop and deans and all the clergy of the Rumanian Church of Transylvania, make known to whoever it may concern, and in particular to the dignitaries of the State that, taking into account the instability of the human life, the immortality of the soul of which we must have the greatest care, free, of our own free will, and moved thereunto by the Holy Spirit, we have united ourselves to the Roman Catholic Church and by the present testimony, we confess that we are members thereof; we receive, confess and believe all that it receives, confesses and believes, and particularly, the four points on which we seemed to be hitherto separated.[200]

132. After the death of Athanasius, the movement of reunion was seriously endangered through a misunderstanding that rose between the Rumanian bishop and the Latin bishop of Transylvania, exploited to the full by Serbian emissaries, the opposition of Calvinists and an extremely ardent, clever, and unscrupulous monk, Stan Popovici. Pope Innocent XIII (1721-1724) transferred the See to the little town of Fagaras in the mountains, out of the reach of whatever Latin bishops might have become too interested. Later, the See was transferred to Blaj where it remained until its suppression by the Bolsheviks in 1948. The Church prospered. Besides the Metropolitan See of Fagaras or Alba Julia, four other dioceses were successively created. In 1872, 1882 and 1900, the Rumanian Catholic Church held its synods, highly praised by Canonist F. X. Wernz, S.J., for the remarkable juridical knowledge displayed by these descendants of the ancient Romans.[201] The clergy of Rumania, to a large extent married, was of high quality. Much of the Rumanian culture springs from the Transylvanian schools of Blaj, Oradea, Beius, Cluj, Gherla. The better students were sent to Western Universities. When Transylvania returned to Rumania, in 1919, it was welcomed by the rest of the nation. As Frollo had established in 1886 in a brochure that is still today quoted with pride by Rumanian Catholics, Rumanian patriotism was and is favored by the Catholic Church, above all in its Rumanian Rite, and is opposed by Orthodoxy.[202] The services rendered by the Catholic Church to Rumania were universally acknowledged when, in 1929, a concordat was ratified between the Holy See and Rumania.

Latin and Armenian Rites

133. The Catholics of the Latin Rite were grouped in the Archdiocese of Bucharest (established in 1883), with suffragants at Jassy (Moldavia), Satu-Mare and Oradea (Transylvania), Timisoara (Banat), Alba-Julia (Transylvania). These dioceses had a splendid system of Catholic schools and other institutions.

134. There were also some 36,000 Catholics of the Armenian Rite, with an apostolic administrator in residence at Gherla-Somes. 18,000 Armenians belong to the dissident Gregorian Church.

135. The bulk of the population was "Orthodox," i.e. dissident. In 1859 Prince John Alexander Cuza began emancipating it from Constantinople, and the Patriarch was much surprised to read in the newspapers of Prince Cuza's reforms.[203] He reacted as energetically as he could, but Prince Cuza quoted so many ancient councils and recent precedents that the argument became difficult.[204] The Phanar gave in and the Rumanian Church became autocephalous. It was, until recently, governed by a Patriarch, assisted by a Holy Synod; it had 19 dioceses grouped under 5 metropolitan sees, all according to the law of May 4, 1925. In general, its attitude towards the Catholic Church was friendly.

Present Status

136. Persecution has suddenly become extremely violent in Rumania, following upon the Moscow Council of July, 1948, where Rumanian Patriarch Justinian distinguished himself by his violence. He had been elected shortly before in conformity with a new law, whereby the Patriarch was chosen no longer by his brother bishops, but by these *and* Parliament (communistically controlled). Justinian returned from Moscow at the end of July. On August 3 and 4 drastic laws were passed in Rumania and Bulgaria as well. On August 3 all confessional schools were nationalized. Anyone resisting the decree was liable to five years in a hard-labor camp and the confiscation of all his property. On the following day the law was passed regulating the state of religion in Rumania. The law is built on the pattern of the infamous Russian law of April, 1929. Churches must register. To have a group recognized, a favorable vote must be had in Parliament, after proposal of the Ministry of Cults. When recognition is solicited, the party must present not only its constitution and by-laws, but its symbol of faith. Bishops and others must swear fealty to the regime, and that they shall

not conspire with any enemy of said popular Republic—Patriarch Justinian had said shortly before in Moscow that the chief enemy was the Pope! All the existing dioceses have been suppressed. New bishops were to be constituted, one for 750,000 inhabitants, by order of Parliament. It seems pathetic that the final Slav effort to crush Rumania should have found a docile Rumanian for the unpleasant duty, Patriarch Justinian. This is far less understandable than Anna Pauker's activities.

137. The splendid Catholic Church of the Rumanian Rite has been totally crushed. A "synod" was organized at Cluj, where 34 Catholic priests of the Rumanian Rite are supposed to have begged Patriarch Justinian to receive them into "Orthodoxy." Their petition was granted, and the police did the rest. Every Catholic bishop is in prison; the greater part of the clergy has been reduced to the same fate.

138. All the "Orthodox" Christians of the Balkans (barring Greece) are moving in the Moscow orbit. Constantinople is scarcely noticeable in the picture. It did its work in the past. The first and the third Rome are now in conflict over the Balkans. Each follows its principle: Rome, as Pope St. Leo wrote on the occasion of Canon 28 of Chalcedon, acts according to divine law. Moscow had brought Canon 28 to its final conclusion: Religion is subordinate to and the instrument of politics.

Conclusions

139. (A) At the beginning, the Popes governed immediately (through their vicar at Thessalonica) all Illyricum, that is, all the Balkans except Thrace. When the new nations appeared, their legitimate national aspirations were first recognized and confirmed by the Holy See. The first official approbation of the Slav language in liturgy, in particular, was that of Pope Adrian II. The first royal crowns to Bulgaria and to Serbia were given by the Popes. Eventually, Constantinople brought Bulgaria, Serbia and Rumania under the hated domination of the Phanar. If Rumania has today the Rumanian language in their liturgy, it is due not to Constantinople, much less to Moscow, but to Rome.

(B) When Constantinople, and later Russia fought Papal influence in the Balkans, it was not for the sake of spiritual interest, but for the extension of political power.

(C) When the Turks invaded any one of the Balkan countries, they were called by Christian princes or had Christian soldiers at their side.

(D) The final schism of 1054 was preceded by the most depressing period in the history of the Papacy.

(E) It cannot be said honestly that the reunion of Transylvania was achieved by violence. Whenever union with Rome was blocked, it was done through deceit (as in the case of Bulgaria in 1861) or violence (in Rumania, 1948). Such deceit and violence may be considered as largely responsible for what we witness today in the Balkans.

Abbreviations

CICO—*Codificazione Canonica Orientale.* Fonti. Serie I, Vols. I-XV; Serie II, Vols. I-XXX Tip. Pol. Vaticana. 1930 ss.—*Pontificia Commissio ad Redigendum Codicem Juris Canonici Orientalis.* Fontes. Series III. Vatic. 1943 ss. We quote mostly Series III. Vol. I. Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis 1943.

DHE—*Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques.* Paris, Letouzey et Ané. 1912 ss.

DTC—*Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique.* Paris, Letouzey et Ané. 1903 ss.

E. d'O.—*Echos d'Orient.* Paris, 1897 ss.

FARLATI—*Illyricum Sacrum.* Auctore Daniele Farlati, S.J. 8 Vols. Venetiis, 1751 ss. Vols. I-V (1751-1775) were written by Farlati; Vols. VI-VII (1800, 1817) in collaboration with Jacobus Coletus; Vol. VIII (1819) is written by Jacobus Coletus alone.

FLICHE ET MARTIN.—Augustin Fliche et Victor Martin. *Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours,* Vols. 1-9 (until 1198). Paris, 1934 ss. We quote particularly Vol. 6, written by E. Amann, and Vol. 7 written by E. Amann and A. Dumas.

GATTI-KOROLEVSKY—Carlo Gatti, Cirillo Korolevsky. I riti e le chiese Orientali. Rifacimento dell'opera francese del P. Raimondo Janin. Vol. I. Il rito bizantino e le chiese bizantine. Genova-Sampierdarena, 1942.

MANSI—*Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio.* Florentiae, 1759 ss. Vol. 36 begins the new series, curantibus Joanne Baptista Martin et R. P. Ludovico Petit, Parisiis 1911 ss. Father Petit, A.A., edited the Eastern Councils.

MGH. SS.—*Monumenta Germaniae Historica.* Scriptores.

O.C.—*Orientalia Christiana.* Pontificio Instituto Orientale. Roma, 1923 ss.

P.L.—*Patrologiae Cursus Completus.* Series Latina, accurante J. P. Migne.

P.C.—*Patrologiae Cursus Competus.* Series Latina, accurante J. P. Migne.

SICO—Sevizio Informazioni Chiese Orientale, Roma, beginning 1 July 1946.

STATISTICA—Statistica con cenni storici della Gerarchia e dei fedeli di Rito Orientale. Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana 1932.

Notes

1. R. Vancourt: Patriarchats, DTC XI, 2253-59.
2. *Ibid.* 2258.
3. Can. 2. Mansi III, 560 B; a diocese was a large administrative unit. In the Eastern empire there were four dioceses: Orient (which included Egypt), Asia, Pontus and Thrace. The diocese was subdivided in provinces.
4. A fine summing up may be had in D'Herbigny, Michael, S.J., *Theologica de Ecclesia.* II, 130-223.
5. Augustin Fliche et Victor Martin, *Histoire de l'Eglise.* III, Paris, 1936, 123 ss.
6. *Ibid.* 224 ff.
7. S. Vailhé, A.A. Constantinople. DTC III, 1351.
8. CICO, Series III, Fontes I, No. 20, p. 78; No. 23, p. 80.
9. Innocent I to Anysius (402) CICO, *ibid.* No. 26, p. 85; to various bishops of Macedonia (414), *ibid.* No. 30, 31; cf. etiam NN^{oo} 39, 43, etc.
10. Codex Justiniani, lib. I, tit. II, lex 6; the emperor claimed it was a return to tradition; "Omni innovatione cessante, vetustatem et canones pristinos ecclesiasticos, qui usque tenuerunt, etiam per omnes Illyrici provincias servari praecipimus." This is startling enough. But see Justinian's law in Cod. I. tit. II, lex 24: "Constantinopolitana Ecclesia omnium aliarum est caput."
11. Bonifatius I (11 March 422) to the Bishops of Thessaly, CICO No. 48, p. 122, cf. etiam No. 46, 47, 65, 66, etc. No. 270, 274, etc.
12. CICO No. 186, p. 367; No. 190, p. 384, etc.
13. At the Council of 681, the bishop of Thessalonica signs: "Joannes, Dei miser. epus Thessalonicae et Vicarius apostolici Throni Romae & legatus." Mansi XI, 669 A.
14. Cf. CICO No. 299, p. 556 s.
15. Novella XI; Nov. CXXXI, cap. 3.
16. Cf. especially the letters of S. Gregory I, CICO No. 235, 237, 238, 239, 245, 246, 247, etc.
17. Mansi II, 1168-69 D.
18. Mansi VII, 441 E.
19. Can. 3, Mansi III, 560.
20. S. Vailhé. Constantinople. DTC III, 1322-24.
21. A distinction must be made between the deposition of Dioscorus, who was a heretic, and the sharp offensive against Alexandria which brought about Can. 28. See especially Mansi VII, 53-62.
22. In the XVIth session. Mansi VII, 423 ss.
23. P.L. LIV. Letters ad Marcianum (991 ss)—Ad Pulcheriam (997 ss)—Ad Anatolium (1001 ss), etc. Finally: "Mihi autem multum fiduciae, Deo per vos operante collatum est quod probasse vos observantiam meam de custodia canonum paternorum, pietatis vestrae affatibus indicastis." P.L. LIV, 1033 B.
24. It became part of the Eastern Canon Law (for Byzantine countries)—When the Nomocanon was translated into Slav, a scholion was introduced to the effect that Can. 28 of Chalcedon was anti-canonical. See CICO Series II, Vol. VI, p. 79, note; Jugie Martinus, A.A. *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium,* Vol. I, Paris, 1926, pp. 86-99, and especially 224-229.
25. *Hist. Eccles.* III, 4. P.G. LXXXVI, 2599-2604.
26. *Ibid.* 2604 C.
27. Evagrius III, 7 P.G., *ibid.* 2609-12.
28. *Ibid.* col. 2613.
29. The Henoticum: Evagrius III. 14, *ibid.* col. 2619-26.

30. The documents on the Acacian Schism: Mansi VII, 969-1142.
31. Constantinople, DTC. III, 1333.
32. When Pope Severinus was assaulted at the Lateran; the first formal condemnation by Rome was in the Roman Synod of 640: Mansi X, 607; yet according to S. Maximus Confessor, Pope Honorius condemned Monothelitism also. P.G. XCI, 143.
33. Theophanes, P.G., CVIII, 861.
34. P.G. CVIII, 848 B.
35. P.G. 108, 889-892.
36. Mansi XII, 951-1154 and XIII, 1-810. The acts are signed by some 335 bishops or bishops' delegates, and many others.
37. Mansi XIV, 133-142. We do not know the number of bishops present at these heretical synods.
38. On March 11, 843, was celebrated for the first time the Sunday of Orthodoxy—the first Sunday in Lent: The triumph of orthodox faith over heresy in general and iconoclasm in particular. The explosion of joy, when taking out once more the icons in the streets must have been overwhelming. From then on, the Byzantine Church which had called itself orthodox in opposition to the anti-chalcedonians, clung to this appellation. It might be wondered if the most distinctive trait of Eastern orthodoxy is not its love of icons and external ritual.
39. Theophanes, P.G. CVIII, 947-994.
40. Vailhé, Constantinople, DTC III, 1341-42.
41. For the considerable recent bibliography on Photius, see Fliche et Martin. *Histoire de l'Eglise,* Vol. VI, Paris 1937, 466 ss. This volume is by E. Amann. The recent work of Francis Dvornik, *The Photian Schism. History and Legend.* Cambridge University Press. Was unavailable when we wrote this study.
42. In 899, two Legates of Pope John IX (898-900) reconciled the warring Photian and Ignatian factions—in 907, a legation of Pope Sergius III brought to Leo VI, the Wise (886-912) permission to contract matrimony for the fourth time, which is against Byzantine Canon Law, and the constitution XC of the same emperor, enacted when he was in a chaster mood. 923, peace between Pope John X (911-928) and Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus (901-907; 912-925);—at the beginning of the 11th century, the name of the Pope disappeared from the diptychs at Constantinople.
43. P.G. CXX, 800, 5.
44. P.L. CXLII, 670-72.
45. Annales Hildesh. (MGH. SS. III), Benevent. (*ibid.* V). Chron. Herimanni (*ibid.* V), have nothing relating to this under 1053. There are very concise references in Lamberti Annales (MGH. SS. V, 155) under 1053 and 1054; Berthold: Annales (*ibid.* p. 269 ad ann. 1055): Sigeberti Chronica (*ibid.* VI, p. 359-60 ad 1054): Chron. Cassinens (*ibid.* VII, p. 696 ad 1054).
46. The documents are in P.L. CXLIII, 744-781; 793-98; 929-1004; P.G. CXX, 719-820; 835-844; 1011-1038. Mansi XIX, 799-806; 811-823; 635-637; 660-670 cf. Fliche et Martin VII, 138-152.
47. De Bello Gothico, III. 14.
48. *Ibid.* III, 38.
49. Farlati, *Illyricum Sacrum,* III, 34-37. Farlati's argument would have been more convincing if Const. Porphyr. had not made it so clear that he knew Constantine Pogonatos under that name, *ibid.* c. 21. P.G. CXIII, 201 B.
50. Constantine Porphyrogenetos. *De administrando imperio,* 31. P.G. CXIII, 281-284.
51. Farlati, III. 40.
52. *De adm. imperio,* 30. P.G. CXIII, 276.
53. Farlati, III, p. 47 ss.
54. He was nearly excommunicated for it. P.L. CXXVI, 764.
55. P.L. CXXVI, 841-42.

56. *Paradiso,* XXXI, 35.
57. Some think this Belgrade was in Dalmatia maritima; Dalmatian Belgrade (or Berat) had bishops from 1059 to 1160 when the See was transferred to Scardon. Farlati IV, 1-9. This seems to us unlikely, though we have no arguments. We favor the Serbian Belgrade.
58. P.L. CXXVI, 760 B.
59. Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum. MGH. SS. XI, 4-15.
60. P.G. CII, 736-37.
61. The bibliography on SS. Cyril and Methodius is immense. A good selection in Fr. Dvornik. *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode Vues de Byzance.* Prague, 1933.
62. MGH. SS. XI, 12.
63. MGH. SS. XI, 12. Thirteen churches are mentioned by name; others were built "ceterisque locis." Accordingly, Pribina's domain was considerable.
64. Annales Fuldenses, ad ann. 846, MGH. SS. I, 364.
65. F. Dvornik. *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode Vues de Byzance.* Prague, 1933, p. 216 ss. J. Ledit, "Les Légendes Slaves de SS. Cyrille et Méthode." *Gregorianum* XIV (1933), p. 554.
66. *Annales Fuldenses.* ad. ann. 863, *ibid.* p. 374.
67. There was in Bulgaria a diocese of Sugdaea; it does not appear that a special language was spoken there. Christianity had certainly penetrated in Sogdiana by the middle of the 7th century. Card. E. Tisserant. Nestorienne *(l'Eglise en Asie Centrale),* DTC XI, 208.
68. *Vie de Constantin,* XV; cf. Fliche et Martin VI, p. 456, note 1.
69. J. Ledit, "Les Légendes Slaves des SS. Cyrille et Méthode." *Gregorianum* XIV (1933), p. 556.
70. Much has been written concerning the "rite" to which the Apostles of the Slavs belonged. This question, of great importance at a later date, must have been secondary at a time when the question of distinct rites does not seem to have been discussed. Until the times of Cerularius and St. Leo IX, as far as we have been able to ascertain, there was no question ever raised about the ritual differences between East and West, since the days of the controversy over the Pasch in the 2nd century. Beginning with Pope Agatho (678-81) who was a Sicilian and therefore a Greek, until Adrian I (772-794) who was a Roman, there is a series of twelve Popes who must have been brought up in some one of the Eastern rites. This did not stop them from arriving at the Papacy. There is no trace of a discussion about the rite to which they belonged. Therefore, the question of "rite" that was to become so tremendous in later dates better be left in the background for the present. Hence we do not share the anxieties of Can. Aloysius L. Tautu about this matter. CICO, Series III. *Acta Romanorum Pontificum,* I, pp. 720-21, 730, 732-33.
71. CICO. Series III. Fontes, Vol. I, No. 333, pp. 700-03.
72. *Ibid.* No. 337-39; pp. 707-710.
73. *Ibid.* No. 348, p. 721.
74. *Ibid.* "ut omni occasione posthabita ad nos de presenti venire procures." P.L. CXXVI, 850.
75. P.L. CXXVI, 904; CICO, Series III, Fontes I. No. 352, p. 732. "Neque enim tribus tantum, sed omnibus linguis Dominum laudare auctoritate sacra monemur, quae praecipit dicens: *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes, et collaudate eum omnes populi,* et apostoli repleti Spiritu sancto *locuti sunt omnibus linguis magnalia Dei;* hinc et Paulus coelesti quoque tuba insonat monens: *Omnis lingua confiteatur quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus in gloria est Dei Patris:* de quibus etiam linguis in prima ad Corinthios epistola satis et manifeste nos admonet quatenus *linguis loquentes ecclesiam Dei aedificemus.* Nec sanae fidei vel doctrinae aliquid obstat sive missas in eadem sclavinica lingua canere, sive sacrum evan-

gelium vel lectiones divinas Novi et Veteris testamenti bene translatas et interpretatas legere aut alia horarum officia omnia psallere." P.L. CXXVI, col. 906 C.

76. Letter Quia te zelo. P.L. CXXIX, 801; CICO *ibid.* No. 356, p. 743. Migne's date of 890 is too late. "Divina autem officia et sacra mysteria ac missarum solemnia quae idem Methodius sclavorum lingua celebrare praesumpsit, quod ne ulterius faceret, super sacratissimum beati Petri corpus juramento firmaverat, sui perjurii reatum perhorrescentes, nullo modo deinceps a quolibet praesumatur, Dei namque nostraque apostolica auctoritate sub anathemati vinculo interdicimus excepto quod ad simplicis populi et non intelligentis aedificationem attinet, si Evangelii vel Apostoli expositio ab eruditis eadem lingua annuntietur et largimur et exhortamur." P.L. ceps a quolibet praesumatur, Dei namque nostraque apostolica auctoritate CXXIX, col. 804 A. The "Apostle" here means the Epistle. The liturgical book where the Epistles are contained is called, in the Eastern rite, the "Apostle."
77. CICO, *ibid.* No. 357, p. 743-44; cf. MGH. VII, p. 352, c. XII.
78. A. Lapôtre. *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège à l'époque carolingienne. Première partie, le Pape Jean VIII.* Paris, 1895. See especially ch. I, "Histoire du Registre," pp.1-29; ch. III, Les Moraves, 91-170.
79. P.L. CXXVI, 929 A, "nostrisque apostolicis litteris glorioso principi Sfentopulco, quas ei asseris fuisse delatas, hoc ipsum significavimus, et neque aliae litterae nostrae ad eum directae sunt, neque episcopo illi palam vel secreto aliud faciendum injunximus, et aliud a te peragendum decrevimus. . . ."
80. Farlati, III, p. 99; p. 94.
81. P.L. CXXXV, 997; this letter is not proved authentic.
82. Farlati, III, 129-130.
83. Farlati, III, 137.
84. P.L. CXLVIII, 554-555.
85. Farlati, III, 143.
86. Hincmari Annales, MGH. SS. I, 473-74.
87. P.G. CII, 627-96.
88. P.L. CXIX, 978-1016.
89. A. Palmieri, Clément (Saint), DTC III, 134-137; Vita Clementis, PG. CXXVI, 1194-1240.
90. When Caloian and Innocent III began to correspond, Caloian claimed that Symeon, Peter and Samuel had been crowned Kings, whereas Innocent III only knew, at first, of Peter and Samuel; he seems to have accepted Caloian's viewpoint. P.L. CCXIV, 1112 s.: cf. S. Vailhé, Bulgarie, DTC II, 1182.
91. *Ibid.*
92. P.G. CXVII, 767-886. For the history of the Bulgarian War, cf. G. Schlumberger: *L'Epopée byzantine à la fin X^e siecle,* I. (Paris, 1896); II (Paris, 1900).
93. Le Quien Michael, O.P.: *Oriens Christianus,* II, 289-92.
94. P.G. CXXIII-CXXVI.
95. P.L. CCXIV, 825.
96. P.L. CCXIV, 1112-1118; CCXV, 155-158; 277-297; 410-417; 551-554.
97. P.L. CCXV, 282 C, 286 C. He also sends "pontificalia ornamenta, caligas et sandalia, amictum et albam, cingulum et succinctorium orarium et manipulum, tunicam et dalmaticam, chirothecas et annulum, planetam et mitram," (286 C). If by then, Patriarch Basil did not look thoroughly like a Latin bishop, he could not blame Pope Innocent.
98. Farlati, VIII, 247.
99. Farlati, VIII, 230-232; *ibid.* 233-34. Bela of Hungary was the brother-in-law of John Assen, whose wife, Mary, was Bela's sister. How the Crusade was stopped in 1238, Farlati, *ibid.* 235.

100. R. Janin, AA., Bulgarie, DHE X, 1140.
101. Farlati, VII, 23.
102. Farlati, VII, 26.
103. S. Savva is claimed by Catholics; See *Acta Sanctorum,* 14 jan.—S. Savva translated the Nomocanon into Slav; cf. CICO. Series II, Vol. VI, p. 24. There was a strong movement for Church Unity on Mount Athos, at the time. G. Hofmann, S.J. "Rom und Athos Kloster." *Orientalia Christiana,* VIII (1926), p. lss. V (1925), p. 137 ss.
104. Farlati, VII, 32; P.L. CCIV, 725-26; acts of the Council, P.L. CCXIV, 727-29.
105. P.L. CCXIV, 726-27.
106. P.L. CCXIV, 971; see however P.L. CCXV, 411, 415.
107. Or was it to Vukan? P.L. CCXV, 28-29.
108. Farlati, VII, 34.
109. F. Vernet, Bogomiles. DTC II, 926-930—A. Palmieri, Bosnie-Herzégovine DTC II, 1042 ss—Louis Léger. "L'héresie des bogomiles en Bosnie et en Bulgarie au moyen-age." *Revue des questions historiques.* VIII (1870), 479-517. This article is a summary of an important volume published in Croatian by Canon Rački, *Bogomili i Patareni.* Could not the origin of the Bogomils be traced to the mission sent by the Paulicians to Bulgaria? cf. Petrus Siculus, P.G. CIV, 1239-1304. A very interesting parallel might be drawn between Jehovah's Witnesses in modern days and these ancient Patarenes; they have surprisingly much in common.
110. Anna Commene, Alexiad, XV; P.G. CXXXI, col. 1167-1186; cf. Euthymios Zigabenos, P.G. CXXX, 1289-1332; P.G. CXXXI, 39-58.
111. Mansi, XXI, 551-560; three copies of a book by Constantine Chrysomalos had already been traced; they were much read in monasteries.
112. Mansi, XXI, 583 ss.
113. Mansi, *ibid.* 597-604.
114. Mansi, XXI, 701 ss.
115. Louis Léger, *ut supra.* 481-483; 503.
116. P.L. CCXIV, 481-482; 725-729; 871-73; 1100; 1108-09.
117. Kulin's wife was sister of the wife of Miroslav ban of Khum (Herzégovina) Miroslav, brother of Nemanya the Elder was Vukan's uncle.
118. P.L. CCXIV, 725-26.
119. *Ibid.*
120. P.L. CCXV, 153-55; besides the letter of John of Casemarino, there is the Profession of faith of the converted Bogomils, P.L. CCXV, 153-55.
121. P.L. CCXV, 240.
122. Matthaeus Parisiensis. Farlati, IV, 47.
123. Farlati, IV, 48.
124. *Ibid.*
125. *Ibid.* 48-52. Joannes Teutonicus later became General of his Order; he died at Strasbourg (Alsace) in 1253. He is venerated as Blessed by the Dominican Order since almost immediately after his death.
126. *Ibid.* 53.
127. Farlati, III, 143.
128. See the remarkable Academia Study: Marion A. Habig, *Catholic Missions in the Later Middle Ages,* p. 26-29.
129. Farlati, IV, 55 ss.
130. *Ibid.* 59.
131. L. Léger, *op. cit.,* p. 514.
132. S. Vailhé, Constantinople, DTC III, 1379.
133. P.L. CCXV, 107 A; later, the Pope declared that Constantinople had been taken "justo Dei judicio" (P.L. CCXV, 455 C), congratulated Emperor Baldwin and his army, *ibid.* 454-461, yet condemned both the deed and the atrocities that accompanied it in a singularly energetic letter to the Cardinal Legate, P.L. CCXV, 699-702, especially, col. 701 A, B.

134. For the following paragraphs see Louis Bréhier. *Vie et Mort de Byzance,* Paris 1947, 447-525; Sir Edward S. Creasy. Turkey. *The History of Nations,* Vol. XIV. New York, 1916. Hans von Eckardt recently called attention to the link between the heresy of hesychasm and the invitation extended to the Turks to come to Europe. Russisches Christentum. München, 1947, p. 74.
135. S. Vailhé, Constantinople, DTC III, 1421.
136. G. Hofmann, in *Orientalia Christiana:* Metrophanes III, O.C. XXXII (1933), 12-14. Jeremiah II, O.C. XXV (1932), 227-48. Meletios Pegas, *ibid.* 251-53; Neophytos II, *ibid.* 254; Timotheos II, *ibid.* 258-59; Cyril Lukaris, O.C. XV (1929), 1-12; Cyril Kontaris, O.C. XX (1930), 1-72; Athanasios Patellaros, O.C. XXXII, 14-17.
137. N. Kapterev, *Character of the Relations Between Russia and the Orthodox West* (in russ.), Moscow, 1885.
138. Encyclical of the Synod of Constantinople (1848) against Pope Pius IX. Mansi XL, 379 ss.
139. Mansi XL, 511-576.
140. Pierling, P. *La Russie et le Saint-Siège,* Paris 1896-1912, 5 Vols. The first four volumes tell the story of the Papal efforts to draw Russia in the Crusade against the Turks and into Church unity from the Council of Florence until Peter the Great; the last volume brings the story to the times of Alexander I.
141. Julian Klaczko. "Les évolutions du problème oriental." *Revue des deux Mondes,* 1 Nov. 1878, p. 7.
142. Concilium Chalcedonense, Can. 28.
143. Gatti-Korolevsky, pp. 179-80.
144. SICO, 1 May 1947, p. 5; 1 June 1947, p. 7.
145. Statistica, p. 110-113; Gatti-Korolevsky, 428-435.
146. SICO, May 15, 1947, pp. 3-4.
147. Statistica (1932), p. 89. There are 72,000 dissident Armenians, who have 35 churches, 68 priests, 3 bishops and a Patriarch.
148. Mansi, XL, 151 ss.
149. Mansi, XL, 155 ss. Patriarch Germanos was executed April 10, 1821.
150. Reunion of Nauplion, *ibid.* 161-168; *Katastatikón* in 25 articles, signed by Count Armansperg, President, and by Maurer, col. 203-208; new episcopal divisions, col. 213-215.
151. The tomos of the patriarchate was published in Greek and French, Mansi XL, col. 450 ss.
152. Gatti-Korolevsky, p. 197. Ladas estimates that after the Balkan wars and the first World War, over two million persons were transferred (and he does not seem to take into account the migrations of Armenians). There were some 600,000 Greeks in Constantinople and Turkish Thrace, and between 1,500,000 and 1,700,000 in Asia Minor. Practically all of them either died or migrated. To this must be added the transmigrations of Greeks and Bulgars, and the return of some 400,000 Moslems who left Greece for Turkey. One would think that the drama of displaced persons was first enacted on the Balkan scene some thirty years ago. Stephen P. Ladas, *The Exchange of Minorities; Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey.* New York, Macmillan, 1932, 849 pp.
153. The new charter of the Greek Church was described in *Echos d'Orient,* XXV (1932), p. 218 ss.
154. The Government tends to limit the number of Sees. The law of 1931 foresees only about 40 metropolitan bishops, whereas the list presented by the Archbishop of Athens kept 54, without counting the island of Crete. (1 metropolitan, 7 bishops). This island is governed by a statute of 166 articles (20 Dec. 1908) established in collaboration by the Patriarch of Constantinople and Prince Georges of Greece. It has, therefore, ecclesiastical autonomy.—The islands formerly under Italy (for which

Mussolini had tried in vain to obtain autocephaly) will probably be brought under the Greek system, if the thing has not yet been done. Greece is aching to extend its authority over the autocephalous Church of Cyprus (1 archbishop, 3 metropolitans), but the British Crown objects.

155. C. Korolevskij, Athos. DHE V, 54-124; bibliography, col. 120-124.

156. The Patriarch discovered that monks are not always easy to govern. In the autumn of 1928, a patriarchal delegation of 3 metropolitans was sent to the Holy Mountain for a canonical visit and some reforms. 17 of the 20 monastery delegates refused to receive them, saying the Patriarch had no longer authority over them. The Patriarchate took a grave view of the matter. The Holy Synod of Constantinople condemned the seventeen monks, and in particular, the monk Varlaam who seems to have been the ringleader, to lose their monastic habit and to be expelled from Athos. They eventually apologized, were suspended from their charge as delegates for six months. *E. d'O.* XXXII (1929), 220-21.

157. Gatti-Korolevsky, 191. In 1933 the Serbs wished to make improvements in their monastery of Khilandar; they could not overcome the opposition of the Greeks.

158. André Billy. *La Grèce.* Grenoble, 1937, p. 144.

159. Gatti-Korolevsky, p. 190.

160. The Catalogue was first published by S. Lampros, Catalogue of the Greek manuscripts on Mount Athos, 2 Vols., Cambridge 1895-1900. Since then the *Harvard Theological Studies* have begun a better catalogue of the manuscripts of Athos; Vol. XI (1924) describes the Mss. of Vatopedi; Vol. XII (1925), those of Lavra. . . .

161. SICO, June 15, 1927, p. 5-6.

162. Hiéromoine Pierre. *L'union de l'Orient avec Rome.* O.C. XVIII (1930).

163. *E. d'O.* XXXV (1932); p. 226.

164. For instance, Benedict XIV, *Allatae sunt* (July 26, 1755). The Pope quotes from several Popes, beginning with St. Leo IX (1053) until his own time. See also Leo XIII, *Orientalium dignitas* (Nov. 30, 1894).

165. Gatti-Korolevsky, p. 434.

166. *Ibid.* 474-530. There are also small groups in Corsica, Malta and elsewhere. Korolevsky mentions an Italo-Albanian priest (Catholic) residing in New York (p. 530). I have not seen his name in the list of Oriental Churches published by Joseph F. Marbach in his *Marriage Legislation for the Oriental Rites in the United States and Canada.* Washington, D. C., 1946. See the splendid bibliography, Gatti-Korolevsky, 593-598.

167. Cordignano, Fulvio, *Geografia ecclesiastica dell'Albania dagli ultimi decenni del secolo XVI alla metá del secolo XVII,* O.C. XXXVI (1934), p. 231.

168. *E. d'O.* XXXII (1929), 353-357.

169. Gatti-Korolevsky, 473.

170. SICO, 1 Nov. 1946, p. 5.

171. Janin. Bulgarie, DHE X, 1182 (Statistics of 1934).

172. Dr. Ivan Dujčev. "Il cattolicesimo in Bulgaria nel sec. XVII." *Orientalia Christiana Analecta,* III. Roma, 1937. When in 1580 Msg. Pietro Cedolini, Bishop of Nona in Dalmatia was sent by Pope Gregory XIII in European Turkey, he was told by merchants from Ragusa that these Paulicians were excommunicated by the Christians of the Greek rite, "e questi pauliciani fanno professione di dipendere del Papa" (p. 1). "These Paulicians profess to depend on the Pope." A strange evolution indeed for Bogomilism! This, however, explains Pietro Salinate's success among them.

173. R. Janin, art. Bulgarie in DHE X, col. 1189.

174. SICO, 15 Sept. 1947, p. 2.

175. SICO, 15 Dec. 1946, pp. 2-4.

176. Mansi, XLV, col. 51-54. All the documents concerning Bulgarian affairs at this period are found in this volume of the famous Collection.

177. *Ibid.* col. 55-56.
178. *Ibid.* col. 93-94. This is a reprint from the article that appeared on the subject in *La Civiltá Cattolica,* Rome, April 27, 1861.
179. Mansi, *ibid.* 93-96.
180. Mansi, XLV, col. 9.
181. Boudou A. *Le Saint Siège et la Russie,* Vol II. Paris, 1925, p. 429 ss.
182. "Russia went so far as affirming that in a very short time a Bulgarian patriarch and, with him, a complete hierarchical *ensemble* would be established independently from Constantinople. What is indeed strange is that the English agents, no less ardent than the Russians in this campaign against union, should have joined in the same *démarches* and the same promises. All these causes explain, without justifying it, the setback that the movement towards unity has suffered." Mansi, XLV, 31-32.
183. SICO, 15 Dec. 1946, p. 2.
184. The principal documents are in Mansi XLV. See particularly:—Ultimatum of Bulgarians to Phanar, 9-21, April, 1866, col. 175-176:—Imperial Document of Turkish Government, 283-286:—Excommunication of Bulgarians by Patriarchate and condemnation of phyletism, col. 531-538 (text in Greek and French):—the incident with the Patriarchate of Jerusalem took the greater part of Session II, *ibid.* col. 442-460.
185. For the Bulgaro-Macedonian side of the controversy, see Christ Anastasoff. *The Tragic Peninsula.* Edition of the Macedonian Political Organization of the United States and Canada. St. Louis, 1938, p. 369. A remarkable bibliography on this burning subject is to be found on pp. 347-360.
186. Joseph Ledit. *Le Cominform Ecclésiastique,* Montréal, 1949, pp. 13-14.
187. Krunoslav Draganović. "Massenübertritte von Katolicken zur 'Orthodoxie' im Kroatischen Sprachgebiet zur Zeit der Türkenherrschaft." O.C. *Periodica,* III (1937).
188. Gatti-Korolevsky, p. 322.
189. *E. d'O.* XXXIII (1930), 361 ss.
190. Georg Hoffmann. *Il beato Bellarmino e gli Orientali.* O.C. VIII (1927).
191. SICO, Oct. 1, 1946, pp. 3-4.
192. Etudes, Oct. 20, 1916, pp. 256-264. It was promulgated at Niš, after ratification by Parliament, Sept. 18, 1914, approved by Pope Benedict XV, March 20, 1915.
193. Yves de la Brière. "Le Concordat yougoslave." *Etudes,* 5-20 août 1937, pp. 385-390.
194. S. Zaratin. *Tito senza maschera.* Trieste, 1947. 169 pp. The style of the booklet is violent; the data, abundant and precise. Cf. also *La Civiltá Cattolica,* June 21, 1947.
195. J. Ledit. *Le Cominform ecclésiastique,* pp. 16, 21.
196. E. Amann, *Nicetas, évêque de Remesiana,* DTC XI, 477-79.
197. See of Milcov, founded 1241 by Gregory IX; siret or Séret, by Urban V in 1370; Baia Mare, established by Martin V between 1417-20, suffragant of Halicz in Poland.—Argès, established 1381; after about 20 years, vacant until 1594; in 1607, the see is transferred to Bacau. Cf. Marion A. Habig, *Catholic Missions in the Later Middle Ages,* pp. 24-26.
198. Statistica, 155. For the letter of Eugene IV to this "Gregory" see Raynaldi. Hist. Eccles. ad annum 1436, xxvii. The Pope congratulates this bishop of Maldoblachia that "retroactis temporibus ipsius Romanae Ecclesiae ritum in cunctis articulis expresse professus, et per chrismatis unctionem quam *ad praesentiam nostram veniens devote suscepisti,* in nostra ac dictae Romanae ecclesiae obedientia confirmatus existis." He gives him faculties to receive "omnes ac singulos Graecos . . . Valachos, Vulgaros et Moldavachos in regn seu confinibus Hungariae," if they ask for reunion and make profession of faith.
199. J. Georgesco, Roumanie, DTC XIV, col. 23.

200. *Collectio Lacensis VI*, 980. These councils are found in *Collectio Lacensis, Acta et decreta Concilio rum recentiorum*, t. VI Friburgi, Herder, 1882, Feb. 1697, col. 969-972; Oct. 1698, col. 971-74; May, 1699, 973-976; Sept. 1699, 977-980; *The Synod of Reunion of 1700*, 979-987; 1701, 987-990; 1711, 989-980; 1713, 989-992.
201. Mansi, XLII, col. 453-952; XLV, 663-800.
202. Dr. Nerset Marian (pseud. for Giovanni L. Frollo): *Rumanian "Pravoslavia" in Face of Roman Orthodoxy*, Czernowitz, 1886. The title itself was telling enough, for "pravoslavia" is the Russian for "orthodoxy." It labeled at once the "orthodox" as a vassal Church. Cf. Georgesco, l.c., 84-87.
203. Mansi, XL, 653-725; cf. especially col. 655.
204. Mansi, XLII, 689 ss.

Study Outline

Gerald C. Treacy, S.J.

By Balkans we mean Southeastern Europe. Before the 19th century the name for this region was Illyricum. In consequence of the migrations that began shortly after the Christian era and ended with the Turkish invasion, the Balkans became a medley of races and nationalities. However, with all its diversity this territory has a unity of its own. It is difficult to define, owing to a long existing state of unbalance. Hence the Balkans have been up to the present one of the most unstable spots of the entire world. Shaped like a funnel, the meeting place of Europe and Asia, the Balkans were destined for a hectic history.

We must disentangle the knot of nationalities and religions which is peculiar to the Balkans, and make of them the religious and political powder-keg of Europe. A great amount of anti-Catholic propaganda is based on a faulty understanding of the Balkan background. Before any missionary work can be attempted the true background must be understood and explained. For example, Red literature today uses SS. Cyril and Methodius' apostolate as an argument for schism. Our important task is to differentiate between religion and religious nationalism, in order to make the proper approach to our separated brethren. Once a clear picture of the background is had, then a clearer picture of what is going on in those countries today will appear. We can render service

to the Church by dispelling whatever false notions may be spread about her modern activities in the countries today under fire.

At the beginning, the Popes governed immediately all the Balkans except Thrace. When the new nations appeared, their rightful national aspirations were first recognized by the Holy See. The first official approbation of the Slav language in the liturgy was that of Pope Adrian II. The first royal crowns to Bulgaria and to Serbia were given by the Popes.

When Constantinople and later Russia fought Papal influence in the Balkans it was not for a spiritual ideal but for the extension of political power.

If we follow carefully the history of the Balkans, we shall find deceit and violence playing a tragic role. Such deceit and violence is largely responsible for what we see happening in the Balkans today.

Questions

What does the word Balkan come from?
What was the old name for the Balkans?
Why have the Balkans been one of the most unstable spots in the world?
What makes the Balkans the religious and political powder-keg of Europe?
How do the Reds treat of the apostolate of SS. Cyril and Methodius?
We must distinguish between religion and religious nationalism. Explain.
What was the decree of the Council of Nicea concerning the Bishop of Alexandria?
How did the law of Theodosius II affect Papal authority?
Why was Canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon harmful?
How did Pope St. Leo I regard this canon?
What is caesaropapism?
What is the story of Photius?
What is the darkest period in the history of the Papacy?
How did Michael Cerularius act toward Rome?
How did the Slavs react to Christianity?

What was the first Slav nation to receive Christianity?
What was the non-aggression pact of the Croats?
What was the attitude of the Croats toward the Franks?
Explain the apostolate of SS. Cyril and Methodius.
What was the teaching of the Bogomils?
How did the Crusades affect the relations of East and West?
How did the Turks come to enter Europe?
How account for a European Turkey today?
How many metropolitan sees are now left in European Turkey?
Who holds the supreme power in the Greek Church?
How is Mount Athos governed?
How successful was the Bulgarian movement toward Rome?
Define autocephaly.
What is the meaning of phyletism?
What three nationalities made the State of Yugoslavia?
Why was Croatia called the bulwark of Christendom?
What was Tito's policy toward religion?
The first and the third Rome are now in conflict over the Balkans. Explain.
Who governed all the Balkans in the beginning?
When the new nations appeared who first recognized them?
What Pope approved the use of the Slav language in the liturgy?
What motive did Constantinople and later Russia have in fighting Papal influence?

The study outline and questions for "The Church in the Balkans," were formulated by Gerald C. Treacy, S.J., who has prepared study club editions of various encyclicals.

Note on the Author

The Rev. Joseph H. Ledit, S.J., was born at Ste. Suzanne, France, February 14, 1898.

Studies: College, Baume les Dames, France, until 1909. From 1909-1914, Eremo di Lanzo, Torinese, Italy. Entered the Society of Jesus August 11, 1914 at Manresa House, Roehampton, England. Continued his novitiate at Los Gatos, California; classical studies were made at the same place from 1916-18. Philosophy at Mount St. Michaels, Spokane, Washington, 1918-21, and Theology at Oña, Spain, 1921-24, Valkenburg, Holland, 1924-25. Was ordained to the priesthood July 29, 1924. Post graduate studies: Biblical Institute, 1925-26; Oriental Institute, 1927-29. Doctorate of the Institute, 1929.

Tertianship: Belgium, 1927.

Professor at Oriental Institute, Rome, 1929-39; Director: *Roman Letters on Modern Atheism,* 1935-39.

Writings: In Europe collaborated on *Orientalia Christiana* (Review of Pontifical Oriental Institute), and on *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique.* Wrote articles for *America* and *Thought;* is regular contributor to *Relations* (Canada) and several other publications. Is author of the following books: *La Croix Paienne, Politique et Education,* and *La filosofia y los mitos modernos,* and two books on Our Lady. Also did many 16 and 32-page pamphlets on social questions.

Lectured in Europe (besides Rome) at the Catholic University of Milano, Royal University of Pisa, Oriental Institute of Naples, at Congresses of Christ the King at Poznan and Liubliana, as well as in many cities of the United States, Canada and Mexico.

Present occupation is that of professor at scholasticate, University of Montreal, Laval University of Quebec, and Thomas More Institute of Montreal. Is member of the editorial staff of *Relations.*

The authors of the various studies of the Missionary Academia express their own views, which are necessarily independent of the National Council of The Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

ACADEMIA STUDIES

Volume 1. 1943-1944

1. Dogmatic Missiology, by Rev. Joseph J. Connor, S.J.
2. The Purpose of Missions, by Rev. Edward L. Murphy, S.J.
3. America's Hour in the Missions, by Very Rev. Msgr. Edward A. Freking
4. The Church in China—The Past, by Rev. Bernard Willeke, O.F.M.
5. The Church in China—Modern Times, by Rev. Joseph Ryan, M.M.
6. Mission Church and Works of Charity, by Rev. Joseph P. Donovan, C.M.
7. Obstacles to Missionary Apostolate, by Rev. Cuthbert Gumbinger, O.F.M. Cap.
8. An Outline of Missiography, by Rev. John J. Considine, M.M.

Volume 2. 1944-1945

1. Holy Scriptures and Missionary Endeavor, by Rev. Charles O'Connor Sloane and Rev. Wendell S. Reilly, S.S.
2. Modern Missions in the United States, by Very Rev. W. Howard Bishop, Rev. Joseph A. Connor, S.S.J. and Rev. Patrick J. Veale, S.S.J.
3. Catholic Missions in Middle Ages, by Rev. George Wetenkamp, O.F.M.
4. Modern Africa, by Rev. Raymond A. Wilhelm, C.S.Sp.
5. Primitive Religions, by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John M. Cooper
6. The Church and the Social Order, by Rev. James A. Kielt, S.S.C.
7. The Church and Cultural Life, by Rev. Allan P. Farrell, S.J.
8. The Church in Hispanic America, by Rev. Roderick Wheeler, O.F.M.

Volume 3. 1945-1946

1. Modern Missions in Oceania, by Rev. Charles F. Decker, S.M.
2. Early Portuguese Missions; St. Francis Xavier, by Rev. Martin P. Harney, S.J.
3. The Philippine Missions, by Rev. Francis X. Clark, S.J.
4. Modern Missions in the Dutch East Indies, by Rev. John Vogelgesang, S.V.D.
5. Colonial Missions Among the Indians, by Rev. Matthias C. Kiemen, O.F.M.
6. American Missionaries, by Rev. James G. Hurley
7. The Holy See and Foreign Missions, by Rev. Edward Goulet, S.J.
8. Hispanic Colonial Missions, by Rev. Roderick Wheeler, O.F.M.

Volume 4. 1946-1947

1. Islamism, Its Rise and Decline, by Rev. Thomas O'Shaughnessy, S.J.
2. Missionary Accommodation, by Rev. Gustav Voss, S.J.
3. Catholicism and Shintoism in Japan, Past and Present, by Rev. Angelus Aschoff, O.F.M.
4. The Apostolate of the Early Church, by Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. McMahon
5. The Laity and the Mission Apostolate, by Mr. Stephen Johnson and Rev. Joseph J. Tennant
6. The Priest and the Mission Apostolate, by Rev. Joseph J. Tennant
7. Missions of Korea and Formosa, by Rev. Laurent Youn
8. Modern Missions in India, by Rev. Michael A. Mathis, C.S.C.

(see back cover for current studies)

ALMA COLLEGE LIBRARY Alma, California

ACADEMIA STUDIES

The Missionary Academia is a course of mission studies for all major seminaries in the United States organized and conducted by The Society for the Propagation of the Faith and The Missionary Union of the Clergy. The Academia has published six volumes, each containing eight studies.

VOLUME 5. 1947-1948

1. The Protestant Missionary Movement, by Mr. Fulton Oursler
2. Modern Indian and Eskimo Missions in North America, by Rev. George M. Waggett, O.M.I.
3. A Native Clergy for Mission Countries, by Rev. Peter Weyland, S.V.D. and Rev. Ambrosio Manaligod, S.V.D.
4. Modern Missions in South America, by Rev. Stephen McKenna, C.SS.R.
5. Rome and the Eastern Churches, by Rev. Andrew Rogosh
6. Modern Missions in Middle America, by Very Rev. Raphael M. Huber, O.F.M. Conv.
7. Hinduism, by Mr. Stephen W. Johnson, A.B. and Rev. Joseph J. Tennant, S.T.D., S.S.L.
8. The Liturgy and the Missions

VOLUME 6. 1948-1949

1. The Church in the Smaller Asiatic Lands, by Rev. Gerard Marinan, S.S.C.
2. Missions of the Later Middle Ages, by Rev. Marian A. Habig, O.F.M.
3. How the Church Conducts its World Missions, by Very Rev. Frederick C. Dietz, M.M.
4. The Apostolate to the Jews, by Rev. John M. Oesterreicher
5. Medical Missions, by Rev. Pierre Charles, S.J.
6. The Church in the Northern Countries, by Hans Bang
7. French Missions in North America, by Rev. Leo E. Ruskowski, S.S.
8. Buddhism, (*To be published in conjunction with the Studies for* 1949-1950)

CURRENT STUDIES—VOLUME 7. 1949-1950

1. The Conversion of Non-Catholics in the United States, by Rev. John T. McGinn, C.S.P. *Published September*
2. The Church in the Balkans, by Rev. Joseph H. Ledit, S.J. *Published October*
3. Catholic Missions in the Belgian Congo, by Rev. Albert Nobels, I.H.M.
4. Present Religions in Tibet and Neighboring Countries, by Rev. Sylvester Sieber, S.V.D.
5. Communism and World Missions, by Rev. Joseph H. Ledit, S.J.
6. The Unity Movement in Protestantism, by Rev. Edward L. Murphy, S.J.
7. The Church in Korea in Modern Times, by Rev. Owen MacPolin
8. Modern Indians of South America, by Rev. Francis X. Lyons, M.M.